UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

- - - - -

NUCLEAR INFRASTRUCTURE

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

- - - - -

SCOPING MEETING

- - - - -

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1999

- - - - -

The meeting was held in The Gorge Room,
Hood River Inn, 1108 East Marina Way,
Hood River, Oregon, at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT:

JIM PARHAM, Facilitator

U.S. Department of Energy (DOE Headquarters)

COLETTE BROWN, PEIS Project Manager,
Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology
SHANE JOHNSON, Program Manager
RAJ SHARMA, NEPA Compliance Officer
CHRIS KARIS

U.S. Department of Energy (Richland, WA, Operations)

DOUG CHAPIN
AL FARABEE
GAIL McCLURE

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table of Contents

Table of Contents (Continued):

Formal Comment Session:

Exhibits:

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. DOUG HOUSTON: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Doug Houston, and I'm the Fast Flux Test Facility Issue Manager for the State of Oregon Office of Energy -- not the Federal Department of Energy, the State of Oregon Office of Energy; I want to make that clear.

And I'd like to welcome everybody here tonight to this meeting. This is your chance to give the Department of Energy your input on this programmatic environmental impact statement.

To get things rolling here, I'll introduce our facilitator, Jim Parham.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, sir.

Thanks for coming. And it looks like we have a very full house, and some interesting outfits out there. With the Halloween season fast approaching, I see that — I see several that I want my daughter to try during the upcoming couple of weeks here. Thanks for coming and taking part of your evening to be here, and welcome to the Department of Energy's Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement Meeting for Accomplishing Expanded Civilian Nuclear Research and Development and Isotope Production Missions in the United States,

including the Role of the Fast Flux Test Facility. And that's a big title, and it's also referred to, the programmatic environmental impact statement, as the Nuclear Infrastructure PEIS.

I'm Jim Parham, and I'll be your facilitator. I'm not an employee of the Department of Energy either, nor am I a representative of them. In fact, I used to be responsible as Chief of Staff of the National Park Service several years back, and had a responsibility for coming out here quite a few times during some meetings such as the Wolverine Reintroduction meetings and Spotted Owl meetings, so you may remember me from that time, which was another period of time that the government and the public were working together to get decisions made.

My job here is two fold. It's really to let you get out of this room today feeling like you got some information from DOE, as well as got your comments heard by DOE. And I think we'll be able to get that done. And also, it's really important that we get out of here feeling that we had and gave everybody an equal opportunity to talk, no matter how different their viewpoints may be from yours. And what I mean by that is, we really want to extend the courtesy that you expect when you're

up here speaking to everyone else who's up speaking. And the opportunity to — catcalls or to whistle during other people's presentations is just really not appropriate, and we don't want to get into that, because we have a low ceiling, one thing, and we also -- it just takes up a lot of time, and we really believe that everyone has a right to be heard here.

This is one of seven scoping meetings being held on the PEIS. Meetings are also being held during October — one was held in Oak Ridge, one in Idaho Falls, Seattle and Portland, of course, earlier this week, of course here, Richland, Washington, tomorrow night, and then Washington, D.C., next week.

The comment period for this began on September 15th, 1999, and runs through October 31st, 1999. And that closing date again is October 31st, 1999. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

These hearings are just one way to provide comments to the DOE on the proposed action addressed in this PEIS. You may also send written comments to DOE at the address listed in the packet; that's by snail-mail. You can do e-mail, you can do

fax, you can call them in on the phone, the voice-mail. They really do give you quite a few opportunities to get your information in by the deadline.

When you registered tonight, you should have received a package of materials that included a comment form and also a meeting evaluation form, and you can return those forms to the registration desk afterwards. Also, we — if you didn't get a packet of material, Sydel and Charlotte up here have additional materials. Is there anyone who needs a packet of the presentation materials for tonight, as they came in and didn't get that? So as they hand that out, let me continue on about some of the other materials.

Some of the materials in the back of the room, there with the posters, include the expert panel report, "Forecast of Future Demands for Medical Isotopes," the Federal Register Notice of Intent that many of you've seen before on this project, and several NASA brochures on the space programs.

Now let's turn to the format of tonight's meeting. One purpose of tonight's session is for DOE representatives to give you some

information on the proposed action detailed in the Notice of Intent.

Ms. Colette Brown, who is the Manager for this EIS, is up here in the front. Colette will be presenting to you a very brief fifteen- or twenty-minute presentation, and at that presentation, we ask you to hold questions for that presentation.

We'll go to a question and answer session for that immediately after her presentation. We'll do that for a few short minutes because of the number of people here who want to comment, and then we'll move into a comment period, and I'll explain that in more details in a second.

The other person up in front with Colette is Shane Johnson, and he's Special Assistant to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology, and is responsible with Colette on programmatic development in this PEIS and other things at DOE, and he'll be up here to answer questions and also listen to comments.

There are other DOE Richland Office officials and DOE headquarters staff up here, and they'll be introduced if they're needed to answer questions, and we'll make sure they're notified.

Again, I said after the brief presentation I'll facilitate a section where you have the opportunity to ask clarifying questions on the presentation. Again, we won't get to every question, but we'll take a few to get that fifteen — ten or fifteen minutes.

Then we'll move to the comment period. We will not take a break; we will go right into the comment period. And at that, we'll let elected officials go first, and then we'll move right into public comments.

Under the public comments section, individuals -- if you read in the NOI or you've heard or attended one of the past couple of meetings the last few nights, individuals have five minutes to talk and give their comments. With the number here, if you can abbreviate that, it's great, and get — give people more time to get through everyone; it's wonderful. And we have a — we'll have a stopwatch just to keep you notified. When you get close to your time, I'll say, "Thirty seconds" or "One minute"; I won't try to — I'll try to catch a point where you're pausing, not to rudely interrupt you.

Representatives of organizations have ten minutes, as well as the elected officials, and we'll let them know the same thing when it gets down to that period of time. I have a handy-dandy stopwatch person here who's really done a good job of keeping me on track.

Again, if you can summarize your comments and turn in those written comments is wonder- -- it's wonderful. If you have written copies of your comments with you tonight, we would love to get those. It's very important, and I'll tell you why, is that we have a court reporter up here who will be taking the question and answer and the comments section and getting that information down in a verbatim transcript. Colette will tell you how they'll use those comments in a little bit during her presentation. But it's very important also that if you give your name, that we — give it pretty clearly and slowly so we can get it on the tape, if you want it on there — you don't have to. And maybe where you came from; it would be interesting to know what part of the country you came from for this meeting. If we don't get your name, we may ask you as you walk away "Could you give us that name again?" It's just because we're

up here; sometimes the acoustics or whatever don't work for us.

Let me, again, just jump quickly over the comments section. Your comments will be recorded by our court reporter. And then what I wanted to say about the comment pieces is that DOE is looking for comments directly related to the scope of this PEIS, so please keep that in mind. However, if you've got comments on other issues addressed — other issues that may indirectly address this EIS scope or on other DOE matters, these comments will be directed to the appropriate DOE offices, so we'll make sure your comments are heard, that they're recorded, and that they're dealt with. And Colette will talk a little bit more about that.

One of the questions that's come up is how we deal with people who want to comment. And there is no sign-up sheet. Over the years, having come out here, I believe the best way and fairest way is to do random selection of people as they raise their hands, so I'll just ask you, if you do want to comment, to raise your hand, and I'll pick you.

You don't know me, I don't know you, so I don't have any way to really figure out any other way to do it than that. I think that will work well.

And if you would, as you raise your hand, please don't go to the microphones or stand in line or queue at the microphones, because we may take — 9:00 o'clock or so, whatever, we'll take a restroom break, so I don't want you to have to stand up there and have to sit down again or whatever. So I'll just ask you to go to one of the two mikes. I'll sort of rotate back and forth with comments between the two microphones. Also, if you feel uncomfortable speaking in front of the group or that the — you have a disability that won't allow you to come to the microphone, we'll bring a microphone back to you. Again, Charlotte or Sydel will do that. And please let me know if you want that type of arrangement.

Finally, after everyone has had their opportunity to give their comments, you know, we'll conclude the formal part of the meeting, and people will stay — hang here for a little bit more time. And I'll go more into the comments section. But I know there's several things we need to have happen

tonight. As I said, we would have an opportunity to get — everyone to get their viewpoints out here. So please, please be courteous to those around you and those at the microphone.

Since we may run long, and I think we will, we'll need to take a restroom break or so; we'll do that around 9:00 p.m. The restrooms are back there in that corner. And there's glasses of water back there in the bar area, no — nothing else but water. And we'll do that, again, in couple of hours later, if needed. So the reason we'll probably do it at 9:00 o'clock is, those of us up here don't — can't get up as easily and move away.

We also know there's several people in here, and we understand from talking to some people locally, there's homecoming evening and there's some high school students here who want to go on to more pressing matters and activities at homecoming, so we're going to try to capture those people too. So Charlotte's up here. If you have a pressing need, you have a babysitter conflict, you have a medical concern that needs to get you back home for dialysis or whatever, please let Charlotte know so she can get to you and we can get to you in the first hour, and that way we'll make sure we get

that, plus the students that need to get out there for the big evening of homecoming. I think that concludes comments.

I would like to go ahead and introduce Colette Brown with the presentation. And after that we'll go to the Q&A session. Thanks.

(Presentation by Ms. Colette Brown was given)

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Colette; appreciate it.

We are going to, at some point, get out some chairs at the -- between the Q&A and the comments section. We'll probably be making some noise in the back of the room. We have about, I'd say, forty or fifty people standing at the back, and we want to make sure we can get some chairs on the sides. I apologize for that; it's not the optimum conditions to listen, and there are still a few chairs. If you are looking for a chair, and I see a few people who asked for one, could you -- if there's just an empty chair near you, would you raise your hand if you do have an empty chair near you? There's not a lot; but, there's probably ten or so — okay, good. Empty chairs, if you want them. Keep your hands high, if you would, just — we're going to offer up the option, then I won't

feel quite as bad up here. Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that. So you see where those chairs are.

What we'd like to do, and we'll take just a few questions on the presentation, because we really want to get down to comments, and we do want to get to elected officials and then right into the individuals and organizations. So what I'll do is, I'll be going back and forth between mikes all evening, and alternating. What I will also do this evening to keep things moving is, I will select someone to ask a question or provide a comment, and then I'll go over here and preselect someone, if you will, to be ready to come up to the microphone for the next question, so we'll move a little quicker that way, so you'll know you're going to get your comments together or your papers or whatever.

So let's move to some quick questions, and if you have one, let's ask — back here, ma'am. Yes, please. And we'd love you to come to the microphone because we can't hear you if you don't, and we won't get it down.

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Public outcry is a driving force behind any environmental protection, including cleaning up the mess at Hanford. If you

restart the reactor, how accessible will information about the activities at Hanford be to the public?

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you. Here you go, right here.

MS. COLETTE BROWN: Since the missions that we're talking about undertaking are civilian in nature, then I suspect anything, any reports that are generated with respect to the kinds of activities that we're doing there will be made available through our normal channels, through the Office of Science and Technology Information, and will be made — are available to the public, so all the — as we do with all our technology reports.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.

A question from this side of the room? Are there any questions to follow up on the presentation specifically? Yes, sir, please step to the mike.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: There is an assumption that NASA is going to need more Pu-238. What basis do you have for that? I've heard that NASA is phasing out Pu-238, and more for solar-powered long-distance missions.

MS. COLETTE BROWN: Right now on its planning books, NASA has three missions that may

require the use of radioisotope thermoelectric generators. There's a 2003 mission to Europa, a 2004 mission to Pluto, the Pluto-Caper Express mission, and the 2007 Solar Probe mission. We currently have enough Pu-238 in inventory for the first two; we don't have enough for the solar probe mission. And our indications are that NASA will continue to need these nuclear space batteries as they have for the last forty years. They have not given us any indication that they won't. And they go -- they only use these when solar power or chemical batteries won't do. They go through a very deliberate decision-making process when they decide to use these things.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, let's go — yes, sir, right here. Yeah.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: On the panel of experts that recommended restarting FFTF, how many people, I'm curious, were affiliated with the nuclear industry, and how many people were representatives of the Surgeon General or the EPA or those types of groups?

MS. COLETTE BROWN: Shane, would you like to answer that?

THE FACILITATOR: Yeah, I think — is that microphone on there, Shane's mike on? Yeah.

MR. SHANE JOHNSON: Yes.

The Department's Federal Advisory Committee for the Office of Nuclear Energy, the Nuclear Energy Research Advisory Committee, is composed of about twenty-four individuals from across the United States. All — essentially, all of them are affiliated, one way or the other, with the nuclear energy industry, either that being academia, there are some people on from some utilities, there is a representative there from the National Resource Defense Council. And the representation is probably more heavily — I mean, it's a committee of subject-matter experts in the field of nuclear energy.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: That would be all? You're saying all?

THE FACILITATOR: Let's -- let me just, so we can -- let's finish up. Are you finished with your question? You have — I'm going to ask for a follow-up here. Yeah, go ahead. Go ahead. You understand —

AUDIENCE MEMBER: So you're saying all of them were from the nuclear energy sector?

THE FACILITATOR: Just a second; I want to repeat your question. Your question is — for clarification, are you saying that all those representatives were from the nuclear industry?

MR. SHANE JOHNSON: They're all in one way or another affiliated, yes, either academia, utility. There is a representative there from the National Institutes of Health; I believe it's the cancer division.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thanks.

I'll put that back. You guys can talk from there if you want to; it should pick up fine. Okay.

Yes, ma'am, how about right here?

AUDIENCE MEMBER [*bumping microphone*]: Well, that was stupid.

THE FACILITATOR: No, that's all right; I got it.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's very tall.

THE FACILITATOR: I got it.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.

And how in the scope of the whole EIS process do you do comparative analysis on medical risks and risks to wildlife and other aspects of all life, and the risk factors that actually come up

with production, and particularly the restart of the FFTF? I'm not sure how that process works, so that I can place my comments in a place that I think that they might be the most productive.

MS. COLETTE BROWN: I can talk to you at —

THE FACILITATOR: Yeah, it's picking up.

MS. COLETTE BROWN: All right. I can talk to you at — more at length about this at one of the breaks, if you want. But just to answer your question now, we look at the impacts based on both for normal operating procedures and in accident situations for release to the air, release to liquid effluents. We look at not only what those impacts are in those situations, but also what the cumulative impacts are — in other words, what's already there at the site, and how this proposed action, this proposed activity would add to what's already on site, so — but I can give you more on that later, if you want.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.

I'm going to go over here first to — and I'll come right to the middle, ma'am. Right here, yes. And then I'll come to you next. Thanks.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can you tell me what the other clients are that these other facilities have and what their percentages break down to what they're producing? In other words, is there somebody who could move over so isotopes could be produced there?

MS. COLETTE BROWN: Yeah, at the Advanced Test Reactor in Idaho, the primary user of that facility is the Navy, where we test Navy reactor fuels. But it is — there is room there for us to make plutonium-238, and there are also medical isotopes being produced there now commercially.

At the High Flux Isotope Reactor in Oak Ridge, the primary user of that reactor — and actually is owned by the Office of Energy Research — well, now known as the Office of Science at DOE. That does research in basic energy science, but there is room there for us to make up to two kilograms per year of plutonium-238. Otherwise, we start impacting their neutron beams and their experiments.

So there is reserve capacity at these facilities, not very much of it. And with a plutonium-238 production capability, there is even

less room for us to make medical isotopes. But it is limited.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could you further explain the Oak Ridge — what that Department of Science actually does there? What are they —

THE FACILITATOR: The question is, what does the -- at Oak Ridge Reservation in Tennessee, what the Department of Science does further there. Is that correct, ma'am?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes; what are they producing?

MR. SHANE JOHNSON: The Department's Office of Science, which was formerly called the Office of Energy Research, at the High Flux Isotope Reactor in Oak Ridge, primarily do beam — neutron scattering experimentation.

MS. COLETTE BROWN: For fusion?

MR. SHANE JOHNSON: No, it's just for -- essentially, basic research on neutron interaction with materials. One of the things they always tell us is these little, thin peanut bags that you can never get open — they do research and develop those kind of materials. But they're looking at, essentially, the fundamental interaction

of neutrons in the lattice structure of materials, and determine various nuclear properties such asspin on subatomic particles. But they do that. They do some irradiation material work, determining neutron capture cross sections for different materials. It's just — it's a lot of theoretical physics-type work.

THE FACILITATOR: Thanks. Okay; yes, ma'am.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Do you expect the FFTF start-up to create more liquid waste, and where do you plan to put it?

MS. COLETTE BROWN: The EIS is going to evaluate all of the waste streams, whether it be low-level, high-level transuranic waste that would be produced as a result of — that would be produced in each alternative, including the alternative to restart FFTF.

Any liquid high-level waste that would be generated as a result of the processing functions — there's no liquid — correct me if I'm wrong — there is no liquid high-level waste generated from operating the reactor itself. There's spent fuel, but there's no liquid high-level

waste. So therefore, there wouldn't be anything going to the existing tanks.

There would be small amounts of high-level waste generated from processing the neptunium
targets to isolate the Pu-238, from processing the targets to harvest these medical isotopes. And those would not be added to the existing tanks. They would be stored in interim storage areas on site prior to final disposition. That could include transportation to WIPP for the transuranic waste or -- but the disposition pathways for those waste streams will be identified in the EIS.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, I think — could we — can you come up to the mike? We'll — no, come on up to the mike, and we'll follow it up on the record. It will be real important, so the court reporter can hear you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. So what you're saying is that it would — you're going to create more liquid wastes, and you're not going to put them in the existing tanks, so does that mean you're going to make more tanks to put them in? Where are you going to put it?

MS. COLETTE BROWN: Al, do you want to answer that?

MR. AL FARABEE: My name is -- my name is Al Farabee; I'm the Project Director of FFTF. I'd like to split your question into two parts.

First part, are we going to make more liquid waste at FFTF? The liquid waste stream, at FFTF that has nuclear activity in it, is thought to be maybe 1,000 to 1,500 gallons a year. That liquid waste stream would be sent to a facility where the liquid part would be evaporated and the bottoms that are left, the dry part, would be buried as low-level solid waste. That's the liquid waste picture for FFTF.

Now, the liquid waste picture for the potential processing of Pu-238 targets, which is separate from the issue of whether or not we would irradiate targets at FFTF to make the Pu-238, that might not occur at Hanford; there's two other places that are being considered that that would occur at. And exactly what we would do with that liquid waste stream is, as Colette said, would be defined and characterized and looked at in the EIS. We don't know what that waste stream would consist

of right now, and we don't know what we would do with it. That is — that is one of the things that we will be looking at in the PEIS.

Colette, did I say that correctly?

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's scary.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thank you.

Okay, Chris, I'm at fifteen minutes, close to, on the Q&A? Okay, thanks.

Okay, what we'd like to do is go ahead and move into the comment period, if we could, 'cause there's a — I would like to get a general feeling of how much coffee we need to perk up in the back of the room. How many people are planning on offering comments this evening at the microphone? Okay. Get out a couple of pounds back there someplace.

And what we'll do, as our — stated in our procedures, is that we're going to do a couple of things, and that is — one is, I think, Charlotte, we're going to be able to get some more chairs in here, so we may be clattering a little bit at the back. But because you'll be at the microphone, we'll be able to pick this up on the microphone and — yeah, put another row up. Yeah,

okay. So we're just going to move you guy back a little, slightly, because we are jam packed out the door. So as we -- nothing like a little house-moving here. That's good; close enough.

And what we'll do is, we'll go to the elected officials first, and then move into individuals and organizations. And I believe there are several representatives or officials representing representatives this evening. What I generally do is start with Federal officials, then state, then local. And because we've been so busy at the registration desk, I have to tell you I'm not really sure if we have -- or who we have representing Federal officials. But these would be elected public officials.

Do we have anybody here representing a U.S. senator or a U.S. congressman being represented? Okay, right – yeah, sure.

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF SENATOR RON WYDEN

SENATOR WYDEN'S REPRESENTATIVE: I'm delivering this statement on behalf of U.S. Senator Ron Wyden:

"Any way you look at it, the Energy Department's environmental impact statement to find a new mission for the FFTF reactor at Hanford is a

colossal waste. First, at $30 million a year to keep FFTF on standby, it's a huge waste of taxpayers' money. Restarting the reactor would produce more high-level nuclear waste, draining valuable resources away from cleaning up the most polluted nuclear facility in the United States. Hanford is not safely storing these wastes now; the last thing we need is to add more dangerous waste to the problem.

"Second, FFTF has been in standby status for seven years, while the Energy Department has tried to find a reason to restart the reactor. They've looked at tritium, and now they are grasping for a new reason to start up the reactor. The Department of Energy keeps throwing good money after bad as they try to patch up a reactor that ought to be left for dead.

"It's time to stop fleecing the taxpayers to pay for an Energy Department scavenger hunt and shift the Department's focus back to cleaning up the mess that's already there."

(*Applause*.)

THE FACILITATOR: This eats into — eats into your time, but I know this is a great statement.

SENATOR WYDEN'S REPRESENTATIVE: It's almost finished:

"From the beginning, the people of Oregon have been overwhelmingly against reopening the FFTF reactor at Hanford, but the Department of Energy insists on prolonging this farce. Restarting the reactor is a waste of time and money that will only result in more nuclear waste for the Northwest.

"I encourage all Oregonians to use these public scoping hearings to send a clear message to the Department of Energy: 'Clean up your mess before you make a new one.'"

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.

Any other U.S. senator, congressional members present, or representatives of?

What about representing the States of Oregon and Washington or whatever? Any state representatives? Okay.

Local, Oregon. Let's start with Oregon local or city officials. County officials? Yes, okay.

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF

CITY OF HOOD RIVER, OREGON

MR. STEVE WHITE: I don't know if there is any Hood River Council members or mayor here.

I'm Steve White from Columbia River United, president, who would like to read the resolution passed by the City of Hood River. This is Resolution 99-12, "A resolution supporting cleanup of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation and opposing the restart of the Fast Flux Test Facility reactor:

"Whereas, the City of Hood River and its citizens are impacted by conditions existing at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Hood River City Council that:

"1. The City of Hood River hereby states that it is strongly opposed to any new missions, programs, projects or activities at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation that would generate waste. The restart of the Fast Flux Test Facility reactor being considered in the current programmatic environmental impact statement would result in the dangerous transportation of plutonium by truck and train, and would create new and dangerous liquid high-level nuclear wastes. It would also divert necessary funds from the mandated cleanup of wastes at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation;

"2. The City urges U.S. Secretary of Energy William Richardson to halt any plans to proceed with the proposed restart of the FFTF nuclear reactor at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation until the site is in full compliance with all applicable state and Federal environmental laws and is deemed in compliance by the directors of the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the Washington Department of Ecology. Cleanup of this massively contaminated site must remain the Department of Energy's top priority, and all actions undertaken must be protective of the Columbia River.

"Approved by the Hood River City Council the 12th day of October 1999."

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Also, from the City of Bingen —

THE FACILITATOR: Oh, okay. Okay.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is the council —

THE FACILITATOR: I think that Jan Brending —

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is Jan here? All right.

THE FACILITATOR: Yes, so Jan would be presenting for that.

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF

CITY OF BINGEN, WASHINGTON

MS. JAN BRENDING: I'll try to talk; I'm losing my voice. This is a resolution, 1999-05, "A resolution of the City of Bingen, Washington, regarding restart of the FFTF nuclear reactor at Hanford Nuclear Reservation:

"Whereas, the City Council of Bingen, Washington, considered information on activities at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation the 19th day of October 1999, now therefore, the City Council of the City of Bingen, Washington, do resolve as follows:

"The City urges U.S. Secretary of Energy William Richardson to halt any plans to proceed with the proposed restart of the FFTF at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation until the site is in full compliance with all state and Federal environmental laws and is deemed in compliance by the directors of EPA and Washington DOE. Cleanup of this contaminated site must remain DOE's top priority.

"Adopted by the City Council of the City of Bingen, Washington, and approved by its Mayor, at a regularly scheduled open public meeting on the 19th day of October 1999."

It's signed Brian Prigel, Mayor.

THE FACILITATOR: Thanks. Okay. Thank you.

I think that's it for the Washington — or excuse me; for Oregon. Do we have anybody from Washington State, elected officials? Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: [*Indiscernible*.]

THE FACILITATOR: I'm sorry, that's not — that's not what I meant. I'm sorry, that's my fault. That is my problem. Also anybody — I think we had somebody from Richland. My fault. Thanks. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF WANDA MUNN

CITY COUNCIL MEMBER, RICHLAND, WASHINGTON

HANFORD COMMUNITIES

MS. WANDA MUNN: My name is Wanda Munn. I am a Richland City Council member, and I'm here because I'm not going to be able to be present at the hearing in Richland tomorrow.

I represent the City of Richland and the Hanford Communities, which are the five communities surrounding, most nearly associated with the Hanford Reservation.

I have personal knowledge of FFTF; I worked there for over eighteen years. I'm a nuclear engineer. I know exactly what the facility is and exactly what it does and what it takes to operate it. I no longer work there. I am not an employee of an individual or any agency that has any relationship with the Department of Energy; I have no vest.

I do hope that the rules of civil conduct will be more prevalent at this hearing than I understand they have been at the two preceding ones. I intend to be simple and brief. My audience is the people sitting behind the desk, not the public who are here to comment also. I'm working on the assumption that those of you behind the desk already know most of the facts that are involved with what we're going to be talking about, so I won't go over them again. I want to talk about the scope of our hearings here and the scope of the study that you are going to undertake with respect to FFTF.

We were a little disappointed that you chose to make this a programmatic EIS. We had hoped you would make it site-specific. We understand the reason why you have made it

programmatic. And having done so, I think the NOI has done a reasonable job of capturing most of the items that must be looked at. Some obviously need, from our point of view, a little more attention.

This is a mature technology. This is an advanced reactor. It is unlike any reactor, either on that site or anywhere else in the United States. It is far more flexible and can do far more things than any other reactor.

In order to see that this scoping hearing includes what needs to be looked at, we must include both the current and projected national needs for a neutron inventory at least for the next twenty years, all for peaceful purposes only. We know very well that the current existing facilities cannot meet that anticipated inventory need -- foremost, the need for radioisotopes for advanced nuclear medical needs which are currently not on the boards, nuclear isotopes that are currently under study for and showing great promise for treatment of various kinds of illnesses, most of which you have already identified, also for commerce and industry.

In commerce and industry, we have needs that are already being met by the other facilities that you have mentioned. We do need

redundant capacity for those, however, and we currently have no redundant capacity. As you have already pointed out, you either have to build something else or you have to use something that's available. And the only thing that's available is this enormously flexible instrument you have at FFTF.

You need to cover the range of projection of cost savings, comparing what the cost for operating this facility is, against the cost of either building or operating other facilities to meet the inventory we're talking about.

The space allocations. In the event that other projects are identified, what source do we have? None. Nothing commercial, nothing domestic.

Life cycle cost comparatives are necessary for the alternatives, taking into consideration whether greenfields are affected and the environmental impacts for any new construction that must be undertaken.

The life cycle waste inventory, both as to type and volume. Clearly, that's of interest to, I'm sure, everyone in this room. It's of

interest to anyone who has anything to do with this facility, as well.

My final comment has to do with two words. You've mentioned research; but, not much has been said about education. This nation no longer leads the world in its expertise of nuclear science and technology. This technology is not going to go away. We either will be in the game and helping to control the direction it goes in a peaceful manner, or else we will lose our hold and our influence entirely. In our zeal to try to avoid nuclear wars, it would be criminal for us to assure that young men and women who have interest in nuclear science and in advanced technologies do not have the widest possible, flexible instrument with which to work and to do their advanced research as they get their education. We don't have what we need now. There isn't anything as flexible as FFTF. If we do not do this, then we are going to have a full generation before we have another facility built that would nearly accommodate those educational needs.

Thank you on behalf of the international technical community, the millions of heart, arthritis, and cancer patients, my city, and

the Hanford communities. I will have written comments submitted later. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

We have — for seven brave people we have chairs up here. And I think, Charlotte, we got chairs in the back. And we have chairs up here, so we don't want you to have to stand that long if we're going to go late. Looks like we will.

Any other elected officials that I missed? No.

We'll go ahead and move to the public comment period. Again let me emphasize the opportunities here are five minutes for individuals, and if you're representing an organization — for instance, you represent the Sierra Club of Washington or Oregon or something, then that's a ten-minute time frame. And we have a timer, and I'll sort of give you the high sign with one minute or thirty seconds or so. And again, we'll pick randomly. I'll start with this side of the room and go to this side of the room, and I'll pick somebody, then sort of tell somebody over here that it's — go ahead and get ready to go, and we'll move that way. Again, if you have a problem with your schedule or a medical disability and need to have you get out for

dialysis or something, Charlotte needs to know that. And then we'll move also — I think we have the homecoming folks.

Last night we had a couple hundred people, the night before a couple hundred people. And I think I do pretty good looking to my left, 'cause I'm left-handed, picking people; and going to the right, sometimes I have a problem. So you guys keep me honest here and make sure that I'm getting far to the sides. But last night I did a pretty miserable job to my left-hand side, but I now know why, is because when I was giving — looking for people to find, there was someone hiding behind a camera, behind a pillar, and I never did get to them, and I kept missing them and missing them and missing them, even though they told me they had a major conflict, and I didn't get them. So I'm going to have you go first, because I have to make that up for missing you last night. If you'd state your — state your name or —

STATEMENT OF GREG DE BRULER

COLUMBIA RIVER UNITED

MR. GREG DE BRULER: Don't start the clock yet.

THE FACILITATOR: Twenty seconds.

MR. GREG DE BRULER: Twenty; okay, that was it; I'll sit down.

My name is Greg de Bruler, and I'm speaking for Columbia River United tonight, as an organization.

The first thing I want to do is, I want to thank the 312 people that showed up here in Hood River because they care about the river and they care about the future.

I've worked on Hanford issues for eleven years now. And I have to read some things into the record because I want the people, one, to understand what this meeting is about, and two, to understand why I am still working on Hanford issues.

"Broken promises, broken promises, broken promises," Admiral Watkins, 1990: "The Cold War is over and there is no further production mission at Hanford; the mission is cleanup." Did they embrace it in 1990? No, they didn't. They wanted to do production.

1993, Hazel O'Leary: "There is no further production mission at Hanford; the mission is cleanup."

Between 1990 and 1993, the U.S. Department of Energy and its contractors searched the world to find partners to run the FFTF reactor. They were unsuccessful. And believe me, they tried. Secretary O'Leary announced that there was no further production mission at FFTF in '93. And in 1995, the U.S. Department of Energy put FFTF into the Tri-Party Agreement to shut it down forever, to bury it — goodbye, it's dead. In 1999 — in 1995 they put it in the Tri-Party Agreement.

O'Leary was lobbied heavily in 1996, and before she left office, she didn't put the final thing to rest. She didn't make the final decision to shut it down. She left the door open.

Then we had Secretary of Energy Pena. He made absolutely no decision, and now we have the problem, why we're here again.

Secretary Richardson, who's the new Secretary of Energy, made a decision not to honor the prior commitments made by the Department of Energy to the people of the Northwest and to the people of this country, because they pay the taxes and they pay for these pork-barrel schemes. It costs $32 million a year to keep the reactor on standby. Let's pretend that in 1990 they had a

spotty mission; it's now almost the year 2000. $320 million have been wasted running back and forth, going "Should we or should we not? Should we or should we not?" Well, we know what they should do, and they should shut it down.

This meeting here is a scoping hearing. And what does that mean? It means that it's our opportunity to tell them what they need to include in this programmatic EIS. Think about this: it's not just FFTF, but it's the whole other facilities that they have to look at all the risks. So I'm going to read into the record what they need to consider at a minimum, and then I'll put written comments.

One, demonstrate a compelling need for any new mission recommended with full consideration of alternative means of meeting these needs. They tell you that NASA needs this stuff. In fact, NASA is already reevaluating the fact that they don't need it, and there's other technologies that they could use. They say three missions; they've got enough for two. We're going to start a reactor up on the need for one mission? It doesn't make sense.

Two, characterize all existing contaminant sources at Hanford and all other sites before additional wastes are added. Why do you need to do that? It's real simple. If you don't know the magnitude of problems at Hanford, you can't calculate the risks to us currently, to the future and future generations. You can't do it. So then, how can you put more waste into it? They have to characterize every site in this country before they can add more waste. Doesn't that seem logical? That's what I would do if I was doing an EIS. And they say they're going to have this thing done by next spring. No way.

Analyze all potential new waste streams and their cumulative impact to the environment at all sites.

Three, do a cost-benefit analysis for all alternatives, including the total life cycle costs, the waste treatment costs, and total disposal costs — and we mean total disposal costs to the time that these materials remain intrinsically hazardous. So if it lasts for 240,000 years or 18 million years or a billion years, they have to calculate the costs all the way out, because they

want to produce more waste, and they have to calculate those costs.

If we're going to talk about a linear accelerator versus FFTF, if you want medical isotopes — I personally think there's other ways to cure cancer. But if you want to cure cancer with medical isotopes, as their slogan is sometimes, build a linear accelerator. You can operate it at one tenth the cost of FFTF. But you've got to do a cost analysis to prove that. That could take a year if they did it right.

Analyze the cost to the current cleanup budget for both maintenance and possible restart. Accurate and verifiable start-up figures must be calculated — include — remember the word "verifiable." Independent verification, not some expert panel that they hired that has all nuclear industry folks on it. That gentleman that asked the question was perfect.

How am I doing on time?

THE FACILITATOR: Five minutes.

MR. GREG DE BRULER: Good.

Include any other — oh, wait; okay.

Five, include any other companion facilities and their cost, waste streams, potential

impacts to the environment, including reprocessing.

We heard tonight that they're going to possibly produce plutonium-238. But what they kind of said and didn't say was, "Well, look it, we're going to take Pu-238, then we got to separate it out, or we're going to have this — we're going to separate it out." But where are they going to separate this stuff? Well, they might not do it at FFTF. Well, they won't do it there, but they might do it at a facility called FMEF, or they might do it at Hanford, but they might not. What they really said was, they aren't going to tell you where they're possibly going to process stuff, process or separate this stuff out to get what they want, the plutonium-238. So they're kind of going to defer it later. They're going to defer a whole bunch of things later. Well, we won't let them because this is why we have scoping. We tell them what's required, and they have to do it, by law.

Six, analyze all transportation costs and risks, including public safety and any counterterrorist actions that may be needed. If they start transporting highly enriched uranium fuel from Germany, the Ports of Portland, the Port of Seattle, already passed resolutions, said they will

not accept it. That means they have to do an EIS for transportation risks. But in order to do this EIS right, they need to look at all the potential counterterrorist actions and the need for security, attack crafts, helicopters, and everything else they need to guard this stuff while they transport it to Hanford.

They need to allow, if they ever were to start up FFTF, for the independent nuclear safety oversight of FFTF. That means simply we don't want DOE to self-regulate themselves. It is a dead end. No thank you; we have to have independent -- independent nuclear oversight, like the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Analyze all impacts from additional spent fuel storage. Remember they said they were going to have spent fuel? Right now at Hanford we have the K-Basins, which is the biggest threat to the Columbia River. It's got all their spent fuel that they just didn't get around to processing. If we have a catastrophic earthquake and the K-Basins were to drain, we will lose the agricultural community out there, if they were to become critical, if the K-Basins were to go down. This isn't my interpretation; this is the United States

Department of Energy in their risk calculations, what would happen. We can't afford it. Analyze all impacts.

And number nine, disclose all safety and environmental risks associated with FFTF restart, based on a new safety analysis. Their safety analysis was done in the '80s. Excuse me; that reactor was built, 1970 technology. 1978-'79, it was constructed. We've learned a lot about reactor safety. And that building has been sitting for a long time. A new safety analysis must be done.

And the last one is the most important one. And these are off the points that you all can read into the record, or tell them what you feel. U.S. DOE must add another alternative, Alternative 5. And what that says is, that permanently shuts down FFTF, without any further production missions nationwide.

Keep in mind — the nuclear industry has created more waste than any industry in the world, has contaminated more land than any industry in the world, has created more risks for the future generations for all of the beings forever -- forever, for however long you can think into the

future, because of the waste that they've created. And they just want to make a little bit more.

So in closing, it's real simple. You folks need to tell them “No.” You need to tell them and speak from your heart what you need to tell them. But just remember one thing, that we, 314 people or -15 people — I don't know, it's growing — 320 people. This is the largest showing, in Hood River. If every one of you persons were to go in the back and pick up a letter and send it, which we have letters you can sign on — a letter counts, to a representative, a thousand people. We've got a lot of strength right here. Let them know what you want to include in the EIS, and let them know what you feel from your heart. And thank you for coming.

THE FACILITATOR: Can I get a copy of your statement? Do you have a copy we could have?

MR. GREG DE BRULER: No.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. But could we get one eventually?

MR. GREG DE BRULER: I'll give you a clean one.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thanks.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Isn't there a court reporter for all the conversation?

THE FACILITATOR: Yeah; we just like to back it up to make sure we're absolutely accurate, just in case we miss a word or two. So, if you have it, that's great. If not, that's what he just said, he can send us one if he so desires.

Okay, so we'll go to this side of the room. We have people who'd like to comment. Yeah, here on the edge. Sure, here. Yeah, then — I'm sorry. People over here who wanted to go? We'll have you go next. Okay, yeah, you and then — okay. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF AN AUDIENCE MEMBER

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay, I just wanted to make sure I had your attention. My concern mainly involves the safety of this machine. I look at this as a mammoth machine. I understand it was built in the late '70s. I presume the design of it happened for — I don't know how many years. Maybe you can give me an idea how many years prior to that it was being designed. Somebody answer that question, maybe.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: 1970.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: About 1970 perhaps? Does that sound about accurate, when it was actually being designed? Maybe in the '60s. Okay, well, I'm

a little concerned about the age of this technology. The woman from Richland stated that this is a mature technology. It kind of sounds like a geriatric technology, to me. This machine is twenty-one years old, it sounds like, from the time it was actually built. And it was run for ten years, and I also understand it was on and off during that whole ten-year period for various reasons. I think there are safety issues here that maybe need to be addressed.

Mr. de Bruler mentioned that the safety analysis happened in the '80s. Folks, this is the '90s. This is — this thing's been sitting around on standby for ten years since that happened. And don't we know a lot more about safety since then?

I understand that this thing is a liquid sodium cooling system device. I also understand that liquid sodium explodes when it comes in contact with air. A machine that's twenty-one years old and has been designed for who knows how many years prior to that — I think there's a lot of technological advances that have happened since then. What happens if one gasket or one valve in this thing messes up because it's so old, and

somehow coolant escapes and it starts an explosion, and that ends up resulting in a nuclear accident?

I also have concerns about what kind of safety containment vessel does this machine have on it. Does it have any kind of major safety mechanisms or containment-type vessels? Maybe somebody can answer that. Is there a safety containment vessel completely around this whole machine to keep any kind of leaking out of the atmosphere? Is it designed specifically for a sodium — or liquid sodium explosion and resultant nuclear explosion?

THE FACILITATOR: We'll take that as a comment for now, please.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. You know, I think there's also been a lot of improvements in metals and alloys since this thing was made, and so that's something else I want to have considered.

I think earthquakes are a major consideration here, too. Is this thing seismically sound? There's been predictions of a major earthquake in the Northwest in the 7 to 9 magnitude. It's going to happen someday. You know, if this thing's running when that happens, is this going to form a major problem with this mammoth machine

that's going to possibly end up in a mammoth accident, a catastrophe?

Just in closing, I'd like to say that starting this old machine up is in direct conflict with the Tri-Party Agreement, and also it definitely goes in contrary to the commitment that Hanford made as a mission for cleanup only.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thank you.

STATEMENT OF STEVEN JOSEPH CURLEY

MR. STEVEN CURLEY: Steven Joseph Curley from Hood River.

This woman from Richland, I appreciated her comments, but she mentioned she's not vested. It seems to me she probably gets a retirement check from the DOE every month or every week or whatever. And she mentioned something about an enormously flexible instrument. Hum, you say. When you have a problem with the FFTF or any nuclear problem, you've got a large problem, a big problem. And I'll tell you what: I grew up about an hour from Three Mile Island, and I wonder how the people out by Chernobyl feel about nuclear problems, and I wonder how the people in Japan from just last week

or last month — how they feel about a nuclear problem.

It seems to me we can get by without starting FFTF. You have access to Pu-238 and medical isotopes on the open market right now. So clean up our mess. It's not just your mess.

I own property around here. What happens if that stuff comes down the river to my properties around here? You know, most real estate values tend to go up. You got a problem on this river here, real estate values are not going up, I'll tell you that right now.

Clean up our existing mess and do not start up FFTF. Permanently shut down FFTF. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

I was looking for the people that were mentioned as going to homecoming. Mr. de Bruler, did you come up with those names of the people?

MR. DE BRULER: Yes?

THE FACILITATOR: Greg, did you come up with the people for homecoming? We'd asked for them earlier, to tell Charlotte. Are they available or —

MR. DE BRULER: If we have students here who want to speak and need to get home — any students who want to speak? I haven't found any right now.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Okay, well, let's keep moving, then, with comments. I'm sorry — okay, I'm going to — if you see them, let us know.

MR. DE BRULER: Okay.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thanks.

Okay, I think we're over to this side. Is that correct? Which side am I on here? We're going to go to the middle; how's that? We'll go here, okay. And then, sir, after her, would you come up on this side? Thank you.

Go ahead, ma'am. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF DEBORAH SEYLER

MS. DEBORAH SEYLER: Thank you. I'm playing hooky from work. And I will contact you with a letter about the questions we were going to talk — and maybe chat with you on the phone, 'cause I do have to go to work.

THE FACILITATOR: I'm going to put this so we can hear you a little better [*adjusting microphone*]. Okay.

MS. DEBORAH SEYLER: The first time I saw a slide study of a cellular deformity from nuclear radiation, I was sixteen, in the archives of Princeton University. That was before I knew that I had been part of a so-called low-dose experimental population of the '50s and '60s. That was before Grave's disease, thyroid cancer, multiple thyroid diseases, and a sixteen-year-old with a breast tumor showed up in my immediate family.

In this EIS, I expect the following things to be addressed thoroughly:

Risk analysis and the cost analysis of what the compensation will be for, in the event of an accident: stillbirth; miscarriage; genetic mutation in plants, animals, insects, amphibians, and fish; birth defects; internal bleeding; illnesses of the mucous membranes; dementia; acute exhaustion; breast tumors; multiple cancers such as testicular and leukemia; blindness; internal and external burns — I might have said this already; if I did, I apologize — thyroid disease and thyroid cancer.

A detailed analysis of the FFTF proposal and its relationship to the fault line that it was knowingly built near.

And I would propose an additional alternative, which could be number 5, a No Action Alternative, a permanent shutdown as agreed to in the Tri-Party Agreement, cleanup of all facilities in the complex.

I would also like to read into the record that I concur with Greg de Bruler:

One, demonstrate a compelling need for any new missions recommended, with full consideration of alternative means of meeting those needs.

Characterize all existing contaminant sources at Hanford and all other sites before adding additional waste.

Analyze all potential new waste streams and their cumulative impacts to the environment at all sites.

Do a cost-benefit analysis for alternatives, all alternatives, including total life cycle costs -- total life cycle costs, waste treatment and disposal costs, examples being a linear accelerator versus the FFTF — and a list of the cost of the current — to the current cleanup budget for both maintenance and possible restart.

Accurate and verifiable start-up figures must be calculated and included.

Include any other companion facilities and their costs, waste streams, and potential impacts to the environment, including reprocessing.

Analyze all transportation costs and risks, including public safety and any counterterrorist actions that may be needed.

Allow for independent nuclear safety oversight of the FFTF restart and operation if restart is recommended.

Analyze all impacts from additional spent fuel storage.

Disclose all safety and environmental risks associated with the FFTF restart, based on a new safety analysis.

And I wanted to thank you, Colette, very much for making sure that this meeting did come here, because I was, as you know, one of the people that came up to Richland and missed work to do that. And if it's okay for me to approach, I have a couple of T-shirts for you to take home. And if you don't remember what we were kind of thinking around here, you can wear them as nightshirts.

THE FACILITATOR: Make sure that your name is in the record, too, because you didn't state it. Thanks.

MS. DEBORAH SEYLER: My name is Deborah, D-e-b-o-r-a-h, Seyler, S-e-y-l-e-r. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Yes, I'm sorry; earlier I was a little distracted. I just want — also remember, if you're an individual, that's fine, you can say you're representing yourself. If you represent an organization, that means you represent a state, local, or national organization, state that so our timer knows that. Thank you.

Yes, right. Thank you. Go ahead, sir.

STATEMENT OF PHILIP McGINNIS

MR. PHILIP McGINNIS: Good evening. My name is Philip McGinnis. I represent myself. I'm from Kennewick, Washington.

I have a comment for the scoping meeting, EIS scoping meeting, and that was that they consider for all their different possibilities for making isotopes and doing research and development, they consider university and National Science

Foundation research and development, and not just Department of Energy research and development.

There are not enough facilities in this country for research and development, especially for nuclear energy and nuclear physics. We need more facilities, and we need more money for research and development, basic applied science. I hope this is addressed in the EIS for whatever choice DOE decides to do to make isotopes.

I'd also like to address the crowd. I graduated from the University of Detroit in 1973. I have to admit I'm biased; I was a little bit dreamy-eyed. I was — wanted to be an engineer like my dad, and I became a mechanical engineer and I worked for Westinghouse, helping to build that plant out there in the desert. It's a beautiful place. It's a little research reactor. I'm really upset that they ever built it at Hanford, though. I wish they'd built it at Los Alamos or Seattle, somewhere where we wouldn't be associated with all the terrible things that people associate with Hanford. We're a very beautiful, clean facility; I wish you could come out there and visit me. You're all invited to come to my house in Kennewick,

Washington. You can ask Mr. Al Farabee for the address.

Thank you. Goodbye.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hi.

THE FACILITATOR: Want to grab that microphone out there? I'm going to pick someone on the other side of the room to go next, too. Okay? Okay.

STATEMENT OF AN AUDIENCE MEMBER

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hi. I'm a student in White Salmon. And I didn't know much about this before I came over here, but this has been really insightful, and thank you for that.

But I was just wondering — the effects of this nuclear waste is awful for the environment and for the animals, and I was just wondering what your opinions were on the effects of that, and if you guys were for -- obviously you're for it, because you're part of the company. But don't you feel awful about the effects that it has on the environment and on the animals and what it does? So if you guys would like to put your comments in I'm not sure.

THE FACILITATOR: At this point, I'll tell you we're taking comments, and we're not going to questions.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay.

THE FACILITATOR: I think they've addressed, you know, some of those issues point blank. But I'd like to really get your comments and your concerns now, and then we're going to move on with more comments.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay.

THE FACILITATOR: But I appreciate —

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay.

THE FACILITATOR: Appreciate it. It does show your concern, too.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF DEBORAH PENNINGTON DAVIS

MS. DEBORAH DAVIS: My name is Deborah Pennington Davis, and I'm from White Salmon. I recently moved there a couple of years ago, and I hope to make this my home for many more years.

And my main — one of my concerns is the safety of drinking water, the safety of the water in the Columbia. I know in White Salmon we have a drinking water problem right now, and so that's been something on the minds of people who

live there, is drinking water quality. And something that many communities up and down the Columbia are faced with is that sooner or later, ten, twenty years down the road, many of us are going to be drinking Columbia — the water from the Columbia River. And I know that recently radioactive material has been found in groundwater beneath Hanford, the area there, and sooner or later, it seems like it's going to be making its way into the Columbia, and it seems sooner than later. And I can buy a filter to take out cryptosporidium and giardia and lead and all kinds of heavy metals, but I don't know of any filter or distillation process that can take radiation out of our water.

And that's my comment. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

I'll go to the gentleman all the way in the back here. Yes. And then coming back here, the guy with the -- I should know the guy that introduced me, but I'm sorry. After that — thank you. Go ahead, sir.

STATEMENT OF PETER GEIST

MR. PETER GEIST: Hello. My name is Peter Geist, and I represent myself. And I want to

thank Greg de Bruler and all the people that have been functioning to keep this thing going.

But what I want to say is, it wasn't along ago, I was in a meeting exactly like this, over there. And there weren't as many people, but my God, we were treated well. I mean, they -- people up there, they took our comments, they wrote down everything we said, and then I got a big pamphlet in the mail with all of our comments and stuff. And I thought, okay, well, that's settled. Can you imagine my surprise when this was coming up again? I thought we had settled this.

It makes absolutely no sense to make more radioactive waste when we don't know what the heck to do with what it is we already have. All you good people — all you good people are taking your -- what is this, Wednesday? -- Wednesday night, coming down here. You've got full faith in your government to listen to you and then do something about it. We did this a long time ago and nothing was done about it. I want you to prove us wrong and do something about it this time.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Just a second.

MR. HOUSTON: Sure.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. And after that I'll come to the lady in black, after that, after — okay. So go ahead, please.

STATEMENT OF DOUG HOUSTON

OREGON OFFICE OF ENERGY

MR. DOUG HOUSTON: Again, my name is Doug Houston, for those who weren't here at the beginning of the meeting, and I'm the FFTF Issue Manager for the Oregon Office of Energy. And on behalf of the Oregon Office of Energy, I'd like to thank the U.S. Department of Energy for conducting these meetings in Oregon.

Over one million Oregonians live along the Columbia River downstream from Hanford, and are directly affected by any actions taken there. Cleanup of the Hanford site is one of the top priorities of Oregonians. The Hanford cleanup job is tough, expensive, hazardous, and staff-intensive. Oregon believes distractions from that cleanup must not be allowed.

Keeping these things in mind, we cannot support any new missions for FFTF unless the following criteria can be satisfied.

First, there must be a compelling need for any new mission. We cannot support any new

missions for FFTF unless FFTF represents the best choice for these missions from economic, technical, public health and safety, and environmental safety standpoints.

We can't support any new missions for FFTF unless operation of FFTF does not compromise Hanford cleanup funding, schedule, or resources.

We cannot support any new missions for FFTF unless operation of FFTF does not significantly increase Hanford's radioactive or hazardous waste burden.

The environmental impact statement must include a detailed examination of DOE's projections for irradiation needs and the rationale for the conclusions. The need for irradiation products, we feel, has not been documented and is not clear.

We must see a broader selection of options in the EIS, to include restart of other shut-
down or standby U.S. DOE facilities. DOE must also examine the potential for use of private sites and modification of existing reactors and accelerators to meet the stated needs.

U.S. DOE must perform a complete examination of the costs of restarting FFTF. The examination must include the costs of restart, operation, shutdown, and decommissioning. Estimates of total life cycle costs must be apparent.

Oregon is particularly concerned about the potential impacts of FFTF operation on current and projected Hanford cleanup operations. U.S. DOE must examine the impacts to Hanford cleanup from FFTF wastes, disposition of spent fuel, and the potential diversion of resources from Hanford cleanup to FFTF operation.

We look forward to reviewing an environmental impact statement that includes a complete and thorough examination and evaluation of the points made here and those contained in our detailed comments. More detailed specific comments were provided to DOE at last night's meeting in Portland.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Over here, then we're going to the lady that's, yeah, waving so artfully back there, after that. Go ahead.

STATEMENT OF LESLIE NEWMAN

MS. LESLIE NEWMAN: Hi. I'm Leslie Newman, and I live in White Salmon. And I just moved there, actually March of this year. I lived in Los Angeles for a while; I worked in a top law firm there. I'm very, very familiar with what happens with nuclear waste, from various clients we represented. I know that they don't have any way to really control it.

And when you have wastes that last for hundreds of thousands of years and they store them in barrels that last for fifty or a hundred years, you have to just look at that. How could that possibly make any sense? It doesn't.

And the thing that's amazing to me, it's like, you know, people are concerned, "Let's see a cost-benefit analysis." You know, if anyone was really considering the future, the cost is so high that there's no way it could possibly ever be rationalized.

I don't believe these materials are needed. Life does not need things that are so dangerous to it. We do not need those materials.

And the thing that I really look at is the kind of person that could get behind a

program like this would be someone who has no ability to see the future, and doesn't care about the future. They're looking at a very short-term span, maybe their job that lasts for ten years or twenty years, and they think, "Oh, I'll just die, and then once I die, then other generations can be concerned about it." And that's the only way I can think people could actually live with themselves and sleep at night with this kind of thing.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

After that, I'm going all the way over on that side and — yes, thank you. Go ahead.

STATEMENT OF HOLLY MacPHERSON

UNITED STATES WIND SURFING ASSOCIATION

MS. HOLLY MacPHERSON: Hello, I would — my name is Holly MacPherson. I'm here kind of twofold, representing myself as a chosen transplanted resident and property owner in Hood River County, as well as the Executive Director for the United States Wind Surfing Association, which happens to be based here in Hood River, and has been for over the last nine years.

I think that there have been some great comments made here this evening. Yes, medical research is critical, education, all of these

things. However, all of those things need a solid foundation, which obviously is not provided by this Hanford site. We have a major problem with the existing contamination in the ground, in the tanks, in the holding facilities, and with this FFTF building itself for the manufacturing process. To restart that again is — it's almost unfathomable — unbelievable.

Anyway, going to the wind surfing side of things, many who live here know this already. This is -- becomes a more than doubly populated area in the summertime. We have a lot of tourism from all over the world, including, you know, the rest of the country. And that is increasing.

Some folks brought up Three Mile Island, Chernobyl. There aren't too many tourist buses cruising through those areas. And with the shift from timber, in some cases, some agricultural or fishing, which could have even worse consequences if something were to happen out at Hanford, that is becoming the main livelihood — recreational tourism and that sort of thing in this area.

And again, with an active nuclear plant of some sort less than a hundred miles

downriver [*sic*], downwind at some times of the year, upwind during other times, I can't imagine that making Hood River, White Salmon, Skamania, Stevenson, Portland, Astoria, or many other areas in this — in this vicinity very popular for that sort of tourism, so —

And I also want to thank CRU for putting out the word to let us all know that this was happening and giving us this forum, as well. Thanks.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Thanks.

We'll go all the way to the back of the room.

STATEMENT OF STEVE ANDRES

MR. STEVE ANDRES: My name is Steve Andres. I'm pretty nervous; I'm not used to standing up in front of people. But I sort of can't believe that I'm here again.

I was born and raised on this river. By the time I was twenty-five, both my parents had had cancer. We ate everything we could out of the river; we foraged, spent our life foraging on the river. So after that, I moved over to a place called Halfway, Oregon, and I bought my farm very cheap from a lady who'd lost her husband, who'd

worked at Hanford for one year in the plutonium production or something like that.

I can't believe I'm standing here again going through this. Twenty-five years ago we fought this whole thing. The DOE wanted to put 500 nuclear power plants in the United States. We fought this thing, and I thought it was — I thought people knew by now that this was a pretty dangerous thing to be doing. But here it comes again.

And I just can't imagine why anyone would want to do this if they weren't getting paid for it. You know, I'm not getting paid to stand here. I just want to see my environment safe here.

And so I propose that the U.S. DOE must add another alternative, which is number 5, which permanently shuts down the FFTF, without any further production missions nationwide.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. As you come up there, I'll go — yes, the gentleman there. Okay.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE SHEPHERD

MR. GEORGE SHEPHERD: My name is George Shepherd, fourth generation native Oregonian.

I can't believe we're here. I really can't believe it. It's like; don't you get it? I

mean, don't you get it? You know, we fought Trojan. A round of applause for Lloyd Marvette.

(*Applause*.)

We fought Pebble Springs; we stopped it. And you keep coming back. I'll tell you what, you're determined people.

But you know, you made a mistake here. We hope this legacy of poison that has been the benchmark of Northwest sacrifice for the nation is at an end. We've given our forests, our soil, our water, our stone. We've made our contribution. And yet we still have to hope. We still have beauty here. And now we are besieged again in the name of medicine and God and country. We have the definition of irony, a hideous irony.

Shame has no face with DOE. The most poorly situated facility is only looked at what you can get away with. It's only recently we've been entertained with hearings amid mind-boggling millions, with billions of dollars yet to be cleaned up.

This isn't wanted here. A mistake was made, estimating the Northwest as lost country. This is the worst decision made this century -- Hanford. Stop it now.

THE FACILITATOR: Here in the back again, please. Yes, go ahead.

STATEMENT OF MIKE CLEMENTS

DR. MIKE CLEMENTS: My name is Dr. Mike Clements. I'm not a real doctor, I'm only a dentist; but, I do have some medical background.

And you know, I would like to start out by saying in response to the lady who was here from Hanford, you want to do medical research? You know, the human race got along pretty well without isotopes for eons. And I would rather die at eighty of prostate cancer than have my children die of leukemia and thyroid cancer, or anybody else's children, by the way.

You know, the government has never lied to us. They've never put troops at New Mexico when they set off the first blasts over there. They never said anything about the Rocky Fork in Denver leaking radiation. They just now tested hundreds of people for thyroid cancer out of Hanford, which was — which is now an admitted leak. But we sit here and expect you to tell us the truth in the future. Are you serious? You know, there are no prior accidents, right? Everything's a clean slate.

You know, nuclear radiation is an insidious killer: has no smell, no taste, you can't see it. It travels in the air and in the water; it spreads out. It has the potential to kill the globe. I don't get why we do this at all. This is addressed, not only to this project, but to any nuclear project. It is — why don't you invest your time and your energy in solar, in solar energy and wind energy and wave energy? I mean, there are so many better ways to do things, folks.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Amen.

DR. MIKE CLEMENTS: Driving down the river today from wind surfing, I heard a broadcast on the radio about the New Mexico burial site. Okay? Now they're going to take four truckloads of waste there for thirty years — thirty years — and they're going to get rid of 2 percent of our current toxic — toxification. Now, does that make any sense to anybody? Huh? You know, I don't get it. Can somebody else get it?

Well, I just implore everybody. You know, you look like smart folks. If you want to do something and if you're interested in nuclear stuff, why don't you find a way to detoxify it? I'm not talking about — I'm not talking about making it

small and burying it someplace where it's going to stay toxic for 200 — what have you — what do you know that happened 250,000 years ago, or even 10,000 years ago, the half-life? You know, you can't — you can't guarantee anybody anything about that. But you sit here and you tell us, "Oh, it's no problem, it's all taken care of; just trust us." Right. Okay. Thanks.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, I promised I would go to the far side of the room, so — I think you had your hand up after -- so you after the gentleman.

STATEMENT OF JEFF BIRDSALL

MR. JEFF BIRDSALL: Hi. My name is Jeff Birdsall, and I live in Trout Lake, Washington. And what I do for a living is help people solve problems. And you might not think there's a lot of problems in Trout Lake, but I have a lot of experience with this.

And I was here last year, and I was — if you were here last year, you just know the amazing amount of information and charts and graphs and incredible stories that were told. And so I was thinking. I came up with a solution, but I didn't get a chance to share it, and then again I get a

chance. Here's my chance; tonight we're here meeting again. And so I'm pretty excited, because now I get to tell you my solution. And I'm going to call this option number 6. And stick with me, because I'm really serious about what I'm presenting tonight.

The way I thought about the solution was, I thought this was a really interesting thing, radioactive material. It can both cause cancer and cure cancer. Just think about that for a second. That's pretty unbelievable. Can you think of anything else that can do that? That's what I started thinking, and I thought I have to make my brain expand to new ways of thinking, and then it occurred to me: broccoli.

Now, this is true. Barns and Franklin in 1976, Berkeley, California, found that too many — too much broccoli can cause cancer, but the right amount of broccoli can help prevent or cure cancer. Wow. So I'm not an algebra whiz; but, I ran this by some friends of mine. So this is my little algebra equation, which is FFTF equals cancer plus cancer reduction. Okay? And broccoli equals the same thing. And I'm pretty sure there's some math majors in the audience tonight, and if you —

if you look at this, you can see that you can cancel off the other things, and that broccoli is then equal to FFTF.

Now, I'm not done yet. Now imagine the possibilities we haven't even considered. We've never really looked into this. What are the possibilities for space exploration with broccoli? What are the weapons potential for broccoli? Imagine. Just choosing Japan and World War II as an easy example, imagine B-52 bombers flying over Japan dropping hundreds and millions of tons of broccoli all over the country, and the Japanese, a not wasteful society, would be just compelled to go gather all the broccoli up, they would get distracted from the war effort, they would consume large quantities of broccoli, and then they would all start having cancer — which we would be just excited as a country: wow, our enemies are dying. And then we could also sell them radiobroccoli isotopes to help them cure their cancer. And it doesn't matter if it works, 'cause we'll make a whole bunch of money — which also excites us.

Now, my one last point to kind of wrap this up and bring it to the seriousness of the -- what I'm trying to present. My grandma, my

grandfather, and my mother have all had cancer; my mom's still alive. My grandma actually died holding my hand, raising her hands to the sky. And I didn't know what she was doing then when she died; I wasn't sure. And then it became apparent to me in the last meeting when I was hearing all this stuff about FFTF. And she was raising her hands to the broccoli in the sky, to the — to her savior and her curse at the same time. And I thought, well, this is it, the whole broccoli thing; I'm right on with this.

But there's one dilemma I'm going to leave you with before I sit down, which is that my family didn't eat broccoli very much, the three members of my family who had cancer, two of whom died. But they all have one thing in common: they all spent most of their life living on military bases.

THE FACILITATOR: I could put the mike right here. Would you like it right here?

MR. COSMOS WORTH: Well, I'm Cosmos Worth.

THE FACILITATOR: Here.

STATEMENT OF COSMOS WORTH

MR. COSMOS WORTH: And we're here to represent the spirit of fun. And the spirit of fun

doesn't like playing around in, you know, nuclear reactive kind of digs. And so we really want to be able to play with y'all a whole bunch and sing lots of songs. So we just wrote this little song just now, and we want to share it with you. And you know the words, so you can join in and sing along [*singing with Ms. Sola Radiance*]:

"We want clean running rivers. We want clean running rivers. We want clean running rivers for our soul — for our soul.

"We want no more waste from reactors, no more waste from reactors, no more waste from reactors — for our soul.

"We want clean running rivers. We want clean running rivers. We want clean running rivers for our soul — for our soul.

"No more DOE broken promises, no more DOE broken promises, no more DOE broken promises for our soul."

One more time:

"We want clean running rivers. We want clean running rivers. We want clean running rivers for our soul — for our soul. Clean running rivers, we want clean running rivers. We want clean running rivers for our soul."

STATEMENT OF SOLA RADIANCE

MS. SOLA RADIANCE: Now, being representatives of the — a nuclear family and representatives of peace on earth and heaven on earth and like, you know, sustainable universal truth, there is only one thing. And it's real simple. My young son here is a nuclear scientist and a physicist and an astroengineer, and he's got the one answer that you need to know. It's all you need to know. Here you go, son:

MS. RADIANCE'S SON: No nukes is good nukes. That is all.

MS. SOLA RADIANCE: A little louder for the folks who couldn't hear in the back.

What he said, folks, is —

MS. RADIANCE'S SON: No nukes is good nukes.

MS. SOLA RADIANCE: Thank you very much.

Just for the record as an individual, what I want to share is like there's a nine-point page here; I don't want to take up all that time to read it. But perhaps we'll leave a copy of that with them people here. And on the bottom of it, we

just want to say “Just shut down the FFTF!” That's all there is.

THE FACILITATOR: Well, given those last two presentations, I think we'll take a five-minute break, and moving into the next section. The restroom are back there. There's water back there. We will only take five minutes, so please come back. And we'll be starting back at that microphone, and I'll select a couple more people. Thank you.

(Recess, 9:00 p.m. until 9:08 p.m.)

THE FACILITATOR: If we could go ahead and get started, please — let's go ahead and get started. Thanks. Let's go ahead and get started if we could. Thanks for coming back promptly. If you could take a seat, we'll go ahead and get started. I'm just going to ask you to please take a seat, and because you came back so early, I'll go — start on this side, in reverse order, just for fun. You, sir, here, and then — ma'am, and then if you'd come over to that microphone. Yeah, thanks. You here, sir. Go ahead. I think we're up and running. There you go. Thanks.

STATEMENT OF BILL CLINE

MR. BILL CLINE: Are we ready? You ready?

THE FACILITATOR: Yeah.

MR. BILL CLINE: Okay, thanks. Okay. My name is Bill Cline, and I live here in Hood River, like most of the — or many in the immediate area like most of the people here, and I represent myself and I represent my family. I'm a single father of three boys, who I raise full time. My boys are twelve, fourteen, and sixteen. And what I have to say is a little bit about the past and a little bit about the future. And as I did in the last hearing, I brought a picture here.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: What's the picture of?

MR. BILL CLINE: That's what I'm going to say in a second. Okay. This is my boys; they're twelve — ten, twelve, and fourteen years old. Okay? That's the future, and the kids that they're going to have. And I brought that to kind of personify things here a little bit.

And then there's the past, which has to do with — well, I guess I could go back to my college days when I earned my degree in political

science, and I — we studied things with nuclear waste as part of my environmental stuff that I was doing. And we were always worried about the waste, and now here I am, more years than I care to admit, right up — down the highway here from a big mess.

And what I'm concerned with here is, you put a lot of logical thought into this environmental impact statement, as you said, a big decision-making tree to try to make it a logical process. You're scientists, and that's understood. And I know that maybe there was a little bit of talk about social impact. But I think it's really important as scientists, even though that maybe doesn't fall in within the logical part, that you have social impact: the feelings of the local residents — which is, of course, why you're holding the hearing -- but also some of the moral imperatives that come with it, with — where our government promised us and promised us this thing was just going to be shut down. So there's two issues here. One is the moral imperative to send a message to my kids and future generations that for once the government's going to keep its word. Okay? Even though your mission may be a little different,

I'd like to see that thing written in there a little bit.

And then the other thing has to do with just simply — you just got to know, it's just really a moral thing. You got to keep your word. And that's all that everybody here is really asking. You said “No.” Don't do it. You don't need to do it right now. Maybe that is a good thing, you know, that you need it for medical -- I'm not even questioning that right now. I'm just saying please keep your word and don't do this. Send a message, for once, to future generations that maybe we can have a trust in our government that they're going to keep their word.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: The picture is there. Yeah.

Yes, ma'am. Thank you. Okay.

STATEMENT OF KAREN HARDING

MS. KAREN HARDING: Thank you. Thanks. My name is Karen Harding, and I am representing -- I am a child care provider. My family and I make our living taking care of little ones for ten other families in our area.

And over the years I have realized that parents with young families have a very difficult time getting out to meetings, especially when they're over and over and over. But that's not to say that they don't have very deep concerns about the world that they're sending their children out into.

So we decided to do something about it this time, and we spent the week on a story level with two-, three-, four-year-olds, five, six, seven, eight. And so I might just tell the story that we talked about this week. And then at the end I asked them a question about how to finish the story, and I can relay that to you also:

"Once upon a time there was a people that lived in a place, and they loved it very much. But they did not get treated well, and so they decided, under great hardship, to go across the sea. And they went across the sea and they got to the other side, and found a very magnificent and beautiful land. Unfortunately, they did not treat the people in the new land very well, either. And one of the things that we learn at day care is that when you don't treat someone well, then you're

always going to be afraid that someone else is not going to treat you well, either. Okay?

"So the people were afraid, and they built — they decided to build some big machines — really, really big machines that would keep them safe. And so they did. And that might have worked for some people for some little while, but ultimately the machines got old, they started leaking, and there was so much poison involved in their fears, that it created all the poison that's leaking out to the river."

And so I asked, you know, "What should the people do, have done or do?"

And I did have one little girl who said, "They should build bigger machines; they should build bigger machines so they would never be afraid." And I said, "Do you think that would work?" And she looked down and she said, "No; I really think they should be friends."

I had someone else, a five-year-old named Ren, who remembered that one time when she just pretended to brush her teeth, that her mother said, "Did you really brush your teeth?" She said, "'No,' and then I really went and brushed my teeth."

And I said, "Well, was it different?" And she said, "Yeah; it was really clean, and I felt really good."

Little children, when they are treated with respect and dignity, can understand a lot of things. And if you can't tell them something so that they can understand it, then it may be fair to say that we don't understand it, either. They have a lot of ideas, but their — and on a mythic level, those ideas are truth.

The banner is signed by all the children who agreed with the ending of our story, that we clean up the mess we got out before we got out something new. And also that we work more at creating solutions that don't involve poison. So they put their handprint, and most of their parents who were picking them up and dropping them off also put their handprint on there and said, "Thank you very much for this opportunity to share in a very important hearing."

The design at the top I do not use lightly, "She who watches." My understanding is that it's been found in several spots in our area in the Gorge, that it is associated with burial sites. I use it as a guardian of life and death, a very appropriate sign for what goes on at Hanford.

And I believe that the water pouring out of the mouth is from the Columbia River, and it deserves to be cleaned up to the highest standards that we can hold, no matter how much it costs.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Yes, go ahead, please.

I'm slightly slower, to let you walk and take your time while walking around, and while you do that, I'll go back to the gentleman all the way in the back there with his hand up, and black and white shirt. Yeah. Yes, sir, go ahead.

STATEMENT OF ROD RICKEL

MR. ROD RICKEL: Thanks. My name is Rod Rickel, and I represent my sector of the human race, I guess: my family, loved ones, all my neighbors. I appreciate everybody showing up here tonight.

I would hope that this environmental impact statement would include exactly what this young lady was talking about, who just spoke, which is to tell the truth.

And I don't — I don't agree with the whole mission of the nuclear industry. I don't know whether we really need the nuclear industry. And

I'm not much of an economist, but I would venture that, had 50 percent of the capital that has been invested or expended — more like expended — in the nuclear industry for just the last twenty-five years, had that been invested in learning to better understand the world we live in, and applied towards nontoxic efforts for producing energy, we'd already be half way there.

Currently -- well, when I was a little kid, the nuclear industry told us that it would be so cheap to produce electric energy, they wouldn't even put meters on it. That's a lie. And the learning curve has been very steep for the nuclear industry, and I don't think — I guess my other great concern I would hope would come out from this environmental impact, is the whole sense of economy about this whole idea of starting this sodium-cooled academic reactor, you know, that it's just a little academic thing.

I grew up not far from a little pickle-barrel reactor at Reed College, and nobody died from irradiation there. They learned a great deal. And I think if we keep the nuclear genie in a smaller bottle, I think we can probably tolerate the academic nature of it. But even if you take this

400-megawatt reactor and operate it at a lower rate of 100 megawatts, the economy is still not there. And there are literally millions of people right in our own United States who can't afford to live — you know, they literally can't afford to live. And so the economy of what you folks are talking about doing doesn't make sense.

And go ahead and do your EIS statement, but don't tell any lies, and make sure that Mr. Richardson and his predecessors have the good grace and the honesty to tell the truth. Because as I talked to Colette earlier, she said that she sensed that there was a lot of mistrust between the public and the Department of Energy. And it's no wonder that there is a lot of mistrust, because the records prove that the accountability has not been there. And were I to do the job that I do daily to earn my bread -- if I were that unaccountable, I wouldn't be working there. I'd be gone; they'd find somebody and some other way to do it.

And so thank you all very much for showing up here. And let's clean it up first.

STATEMENT OF HAROLD ANDERSON

MR. HAROLD ANDERSON: My name is Harold Anderson. I'm from Richland, Washington, for the last twenty-six years. For the prior twenty-two years, I was born in Seattle and raised there, educated there from kindergarten through twelfth grade, and received a BSEE from the University of Washington.

And unlike one of the first speakers, I guess I am vested in Hanford, because from the University of Washington, class of '73, I was hired to come and work at Westinghouse Hanford Company, which was overseeing the construction of the Fast Flux Test Facility at that time. At that time it was — it had recently been nothing but a hole in the ground, and at the — and they were just constructing the containment vessel, which is one-inch thick carbon steel. Somebody was asking earlier tonight would it contain the worst accident, and the answer is “Yes.”

And I was involved as an electrical engineer to do development testing, start-up testing, maintenance, in the way of calibrations and corrective maintenance and modifications to update some of the instrumentation, in particular, on the

refueling machines, of which there are three, which form a rotating part of the reactor head.

Before I came to Richland, I had heard it was a desert, it was going to be over 100 degrees, there would be strong winds and there was going to be a lot of radioactive contamination. And coming from one of the nation's most livable cities, I was apprehensive about going there. However, I was pleasantly surprised that normal people lived there, friendly people. I would — I walked up to total strangers and said “Hello,” and they said “Hello” back, type of thing.

I went to work and found out that the reactor was built out of — well, it was a giant machine. The refueling machines themselves are about two stories tall. But they were made out of stainless steel, bright and shiny, and even today they're still bright and shiny. The reactor is in the — in its prime of life. I don't think that the *Seattle P-I* characterized it correctly, saying it's an old reactor. I found it to be safe.

One can stand at the site boundary of the FFTF and get less radiation in a year's time than from eating one banana. I've been drinking the water that's pumped out of the Columbia River about

five miles south of Hanford for the last twenty-six years. No ill effects.

When I go down to work on the reactor head and stand there about twenty-five feet up from the 400-megawatt fission reaction going on — but where I stand, I only experience a radiation about less than 2 millirem, or just a little bit above background. And if I stood there for three solid weeks, twenty-four hours a day, then I would accumulate the same dose that living in Spokane would give me for living there for a year, just from Spokane's natural background radiation.

The FFTF is a $1.5 billion investment, so if we shut it down, we're going to throw away that much money, and make an even bigger impact on the economy. It's not just to save $40 million a year.

How am I doing on time?

THE FACILITATOR: Thirty seconds.

MR. HAROLD ANDERSON: Okay. It can be used to save — or to eliminate long-lived waste by recycling them through the fast neutron flux. The spent fuel will not be a threat to the river, and its additional amount will be less than one

percent to the fuel that's -- spent fuel that's already at Hanford.

Also, you can be a cancer fighter by keeping the reactor going. "Dateline NBC" last November, '98 —

That's it?

THE FACILITATOR: Five minutes.

MR. HAROLD ANDERSON: Okay. If you see — get a tape of "Dateline NBC," you will see that the medical isotopes can cure cancer.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's despicable that —

THE FACILITATOR: Hold it.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: — you folks from Richland —

THE FACILITATOR: Hold it, sir.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: — hire a [expletive] bus to come down here and stack the [expletive] hearing.

THE FACILITATOR: Sir — sir, hey —

AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's despicable.

THE FACILITATOR: Hey, none of that obscene language, or we'll — that's it. That's it.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's disgraceful.

THE FACILITATOR: Sir, please; that's ridiculous.

Okay, right here. Okay, and — okay. Okay, go ahead, sir, please.

STATEMENT OF DAN JOHNSTON

MR. DAN JOHNSTON: I'm Dan Johnston. I work at the FFTF. I'm an engineer there. I've been working there for twenty-three years. No, we did not hire a bus to come down here.

And there were several concerns that have been mentioned I wanted to address, plus some things I think should be added to the EIS.

There was concerns raised about the safety of this machine. One of the things that makes this reactor unique is that it's the only government reactor that has been evaluated under the same safety guidelines as every civilian reactor that's operating in the United States, and the United States is the world leader in safety technology.

There are two things I think should be added to the EIS. It currently lists — looking at 5 kilograms of plutonium-238, based on the current need for NASA. Doesn't make any allowances for any additional future needs. Perhaps that

amount should be increased, and that would give a more realistic need or maybe just prove a need.

The other program that I don't see listed that I think would be very meaningful to the folks here — when we look at the waste and the half-life to the high-level radioactive waste that's there, and we start talking in terms of 20,000, 30,000, 100,000 years, there are programs where you can continue to irradiate that, and you break down some of the active ions that are there, and you start dealing with half-lives that are dealing with 50 years, 100 years, and 200 years. A big difference in cost. And it strikes me as responsible to look at developing that if it's feasible.

And then the third thing is, currently we're looking at evaluating it at 100 megawatts. It would seem to me to be far safer to use the evaluations that have already been done for 400-megawatt accidents. That would more than encompass what could happen at 100 megawatts.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thanks a lot.

Yes, sir.

STATEMENT OF SAM DUNLAP

MR. SAM DUNLAP: My name is Sam Dunlap, and I'm representing myself. I'm also the President of a company called Heal Thy Community, and my passion is raising resilient children and building community.

I, too, can't believe that I'm here again.

As a little kid, I listened to President Eisenhower dedicate the Shippingport reactor and herald a new era of clean, safe, nuclear energy, and I stood right out here on this bridge in protest when they brought that Shippingport reactor home to its final resting place at Hanford, at the Hanford Reservation.

I recognize you guys. I've asked you this question before, and I'm going to be here every time you have a hearing, and I'm going to ask you the same question. It's a source of considerable anguish to this child to sit and watch well-intentioned, honest, hard-working, white bureaucrats sit in a room in front of a largely hostile audience and make promises that they have no intention of staying in place long enough to redeem. You not only won't be here to redeem your promises, but

forget redeeming the promises that were made by your fathers. And let's not even talk about the promises that were made by your grandfathers.

Because the Hanford Reservation wasn't always the Hanford Reservation. It was called White Cliffs by the people, and it was a holy and sacred place. And your grandfather promised my grandfather, or your father promised my grandfather that they only needed White Cliffs long enough to win the war, and then the people could have it back. And so my question to you is “When will be — when will be — when will we be allowed to return to White Cliffs to pray? When will be — we be allowed to return to that land and practice those sacred ceremonies that saved the earth? And which of our children, seven generations from now, will be able to go on that land and gather the medicines and perform the ceremonies that saved the earth?”

I looked at your alternatives, and I didn't see one numbered Alternative 5, that said, "Shut down the Fast Flux reactor and don't start any others anywhere in the country." And even though you said it is possible to come out with a decision like that, I don't trust a process that will yield a decision that's not on the chart.

Because what other decisions that are not on the chart might that decision tree yield? So I think, as a minimum, you need to add one that says, "Alternative 5 permanently shuts down FFTF without any production missions nationwide."

I looked at the things that your EIS will consider, and I find no consideration for the cultural and spiritual issues that I — that I'm concerned about. I could find no consideration of the government-to-government relationships between DOE and the tribe or the native people, or the Wanapum, the people that lived along the river.

And since we're talking about keeping your word, I want to ask again, “When will we be allowed to return to Lone Mountain to pray? When will we be allowed to return to White Cliffs to pray? When will our children be allowed to go on that land and gather the medicines and perform the ceremonies that saved the earth?”

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Over here. Ma'am, yes, after him.

STATEMENT OF MIKE MICHOVSKY

MR. MIKE MICHOVSKY: My name is Mike Michovsky. I live in Mosier, or near Mosier,

Oregon, which is about five miles east of Hood River.

Colette, you started off by saying that these public meetings have been proven to work time and again. I think you're right, because we were here before, and it keeps going on, and nothing seems to be decided.

I also kind of object to the word "missions." I really don't like that word. I think the people here have a mission to shut this all down, but to refer to these objectives as missions really offends me.

So I live about two miles or so from the river, so I have some concern about this. But if I lived in Norway, I think I'd have just as much concern because I'm a citizen of the planet that's all of our home here that we cohabitate.

And it seems to me that there's really no question about — there's really no issue here. Anybody could sit down in ten minutes or less and look this over and go "There's no issue here. They can't start that thing up; it's insane." And everybody here knows that, and anyone here who can't relate to that kind of logic, in my mind, they're simply deluding themselves. They have a job that

relates to the industry, as you all do. As you stated earlier, everybody that was involved in setting this up is involved in the nuclear industry. Doesn't make any sense.

So why are we here again? It's got to be obvious to anyone who thinks. There's only one possible reason why we're here discussing this, and it's because there's tremendous fortunes to be made by certain people. And I don't believe it's anyone in this room; I think it's people that are way filtered up above all this. So this discussion of "Let's" —

The main issue that was brought up at the last meeting had to do with medical isotopes, and it's being kind of played down a little bit this time. Now it's space missions. But medical isotopes being used to treat cancer so that a relative few people can live a few more years, at the potential prodigious risks of myriad generations of cancer and worse — I mean, is there some logic here? I don't — it escapes me. It goes right over my head. There's nothing in it but money. And whether you agree with that or not, that's where it is. If you sit down and feel into it for a little bit, anyone in this room will get that.

People who have jobs here in the nuclear industry, people from the Tri-Cities, I don't blame them for being concerned about losing a good-paying job. It's not that they're getting rich; they aren't. They have a good, livable wage. But the issue is big money.

And the fact is that — correct me if I'm wrong, but it seems to me that one in three people will develop cancer these days. And there's a reason for that. It's the fact that there's a lot of toxins in our environment. And the idea that we can clean up someone's ill health with radioactive material — again, it's totally ludicrous. It's completely beyond me.

I feel that we're being pandered to, to our sense of compassion on that issue. I think everybody here's compassionate, whether we're getting excited about this or not. It's simply because we don't feel we're being listened to.

I believe that this sort of a meeting where there's the inference that we're being listened to is the reason why people don't vote in this country. Because we can sit here and talk to you, and then have to have another meeting to say it

all again. People aren't listened to in this country.

And the only thing I have to close by is just we need to shut the whole stupid thing down. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: This lady here. I'll adjust that microphone for you.

STATEMENT OF CATHY SNYDER

MS. CATHY SNYDER: I didn't get that far.

THE FACILITATOR: Do you want to come to this microphone?

MS. CATHY SNYDER: Hello. My name is Cathy Snyder. I live in Husum, Washington, and I'm a fourth generation Columbia Gorge resident.

Yes, it's quite amazing that we're here again. I guess that's the theme for tonight. Gosh, I don't know how many protests I've made against this Hanford Reservation in general, from way back to the white train, laying on the tracks, to standing on the Columbia River bridge, to going up to Richland, to coming to many meetings — many, many meetings, and writing letters. I — you know, they must know me really well, that's all I can say,

if they really are listening to me, because, you know, it just — I don't know what else to say.

I am opposed to the restarting of the FFTF reactor for any reason. I ask you to stop this study process, period. If you proceed — no, I'm not even going to read that part. I just ask you to stop. You think, again, it comes down to money. How many millions and billions of dollars are we spending, paying salaries of people researching this? How much money is being diverted from the cleanup fund to researching this process of possibly restarting this? How much money is being spent from other funds, from maybe my Social Security fund? I don't know. You know, it really all does come down to money. And I want all the money to stop funding the research of reopening the FFTF. I want them to take it off standby. There is no reason for this to happen. The person that made this decision ten years ago, seven years ago — really, I don't want — that position and office does not have, should not have the power to be able to do that, after thousands of Oregonians, thousands and thousands of us have said “No.” That's outrageous. And Washingtonians.

The other thing, we've made it clear that we want this done; that we want this stopped. Congress has mandated the cleanup money. Quit using our money to study the restart of FFTF. Use our money to shut it down and clean it up.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: We'll take someone from the middle. Yes.

STATEMENT OF CATHERINE ZANGAR

MS. CATHERINE ZANGAR: There, I think that'll work. My name is Catherine Zangar. I live in Hood River. I'm previously from White Salmon. I grew up and spent my entire childhood in Richland, Washington. I think I understand the mentality pretty well. I was teethed on money from Hanford safety issues. All my family, almost, has worked out there.

And I understand the intellectual desire to pursue things at Hanford, but I'm very much against — Hanford money and resources educated us very well, and most people, by the time they were in high school in Richland, we understood the monster we'd created out there, and how we created a waste product we couldn't contain, we couldn't take care of. We weren't ready to vitrify it. In 1966,

I was being told how that waste product would be vitrified. Europe has started doing that; we haven't gotten there yet.

And I can't -- I do believe I'm a cynic. I'm not surprised to be here. I was in Alaska when I read the *National Fishermen's Journal* telling me what I had been exposed to swimming in the Columbia River as a child. It didn't come out in the *Tri-City Herald*, people from Richland. You won't hear that there. You won't hear any of the information that you need to make an objective, rational decision.

I think it's incredible that we would go to the scientists in the industry and people associated with that industry and the people who live on that industry for information and input on making a broad decision about how we pollute our planet. It doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense when we go to the people who live off the timber industry and go, "What do you think, should we protect the spotted owl?" It's the same kind of situation. And we all make sacrifices. I am willing to sacrifice. I am willing to stop using aluminum foil. I'm willing to quit using Saran wrap. I'm willing to have cancer without a

radioisotope to save my life, because I'll use other means to protect myself. And if I lose that gamble after having swam in and lived in radiation exposure for my whole childhood, I'm still willing to give up that potential cure, because I don't want a waste that — you told us earlier this evening that the plan for this facility, this Fast Flux Test Facility that I want shut down permanently and just eliminated, that waste is going to interim containment. What is interim containment? And we solidify it? It's not in a stable state. It's not in a state that can't be again a contaminant and a serious danger.

So until you come to these citizens and say, "We now have a way to guarantee your safety and guarantee that we can handle the waste product, and that we are doing that." Then I would listen to you about having a nuclear industry. And I'm not willing to consider it until then.

I'm not surprised to see you back here again, and I bet we'll be doing this again, because there are money and academic people who have a lot of power, who really want to see this kind of thing happen. And I know how much it means to people in research to have the tools that they want.

And it's not that I'm against research. I have family in research, and I have a research-oriented mind.

I don't think we need this for educational purposes. If you look at our history of where we have — educational leaders in the nuclear industry have led the world as a nuclear leader. And what's happening with nuclear activities around the world? Look where we've led them. Do we need that leadership role? We should relook at our role and how we lead people as a nuclear industry, as a state that does nuclear industry.

Where do I want to lead them? I want to lead them into closing it down. I don't think we need it for anything right now until we can clean it up and use it well.

I see here all kinds of red flags in the conversations we have tonight about waste, about interim containment. I'm concerned here that NASA is taking nuclear products out into space. Who gave them a permit to pollute the space? I mean that's — it's not like we have this — we have such small vision to do something like that.

And so I've been given a one-minute signal, so I guess I would like to say in conclusion

that I wasn't surprised, but I'm concerned that a number 5 option isn't on this list of options, that the most important and essential option wasn't actually written down and stated clearly, and that option was to close down the FFTF, period. And the fact that it wasn't written there shows me a lot about where this whole thing is going, and that scares me. So I think that needs to be relooked at. It needs to be considered as the number 1 option. Move the others down, and look at it that way.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Yes. Yeah, we'll go ahead and take you, and then you can come up here. I just pointed — I think we both pointed to the same thing. Go ahead and start here, and then come over here. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF CATHY CARLSON

MS. CATHY CARLSON: Okay, my name is Cathy Carlson, and I live here in Hood River.

And we've been talking like about — a lot about money here tonight, and they've been doing the cleanup. I don't know what cleanup they've done, because they started out — they had 177 tanks and they still have 177 tanks, and they've still got all this stuff in them. I don't know how

many were leaking then, but 68 of them are leaking now. And they don't really even know what they're going to do with all this stuff. We've been doing this for ten years. They've spent $13 billion doing this, and where did all that money go, if we want to talk about money and cost-effectiveness?

And now we're talking about making more waste, only 1,500 gallons or so a year, and we're only going to take it apart and ship it somewhere else and bury it under the ground, but really not there. But what happened to the cleanup? It sounds like that cleanup and start-up cannot possibly be in the same world. You can't — if you can't clean it up, don't make the mess.

They've — it's been proven that we don't know how to clean it up. Otherwise, after ten years and $13 billion, you would think that maybe we would have gotten word of at least one leaking tank. It's just a total amazing thing to me.

How can they tell us that they're going to close the whole thing down in meetings that they spent $5 billion having, between Washington and Oregon and the DOE and all those other people, and they say, "Okay, we're going to shut this down," and then somebody can go out of office and not sign a

paper, and that is all history? Where is the accountability here?

There's a thing -- I don't know, there's a Federal thing, it's called racketeering, and it's when people deceive other people and they get their money. And it sounds to me like this is racketeering. I think we should check into that.

I heard that there's -- there was 34,000 picocuries per liter in the water, in the groundwater. This is like — it's an unfathomable number. I have no idea what this curie thing is; I just know it's radioactive, and I know that it can't be good. It doesn't sound like cleanup to me. It doesn't sound like that you can create more waste and be so irresponsible to think that only 1,500 gallons a year is like — I mean, even one gallon of this stuff sounds deadly.

So I would just like to say that you need to analyze all potential new waste streams, their cumulative impact on the environment at all sites, that you need to analyze all impacts from additional spent — leak — fuel storage. You've got to take Alternative 5 and, again, change it to number 1. That permanently shuts down the FFTF,

without any further production missions nationwide — worldwide, as far as I'm concerned.

THE FACILITATOR: Did you want me to take a copy of that? Do you have a copy?

MS. CATHY CARLSON: No.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Okay, this one, we'll go here, and then I'm going to go all the way over here, because I've not been on this side, so — and then — I'm sorry, I didn't see you. Go ahead here, and then over here. Thanks. Sorry. We'll be back to you shortly.

STATEMENT OF MOLLY SEE

MS. MOLLY SEE: Well, these speeches have been hard acts for me to follow. My name is Molly See, and I'm from White Salmon, Washington. I'm a grandmother and a writer. The grandmother part is why I do this.

One, I'm glad that we people downriver from Hanford have this chance to tell you how we feel about the past and present impacts of Hanford activities, as well as about the future ones that are part of this scoping process. Because it's unrealistic to think that the three are unrelated and not woven together in our minds. It would be like saying to your eleven-year-old grandson, "Hey,

I'm really glad you're wearing those muddy boots in the same places you did before, and that you even thought of some new places like the guest bedroom and the attic; keep it up."

I'm glad you, officials, are here to see the tip of the iceberg concerning people who live in this area, how they feel. I was born and raised in Hood River, and I've lived in parts of Washington for some time. I've never met anyone, except at these meetings and these hearings, who has ever said, "Hey, I'm happy about the Hanford of today."

There are people here; there are people who are not here. They may not speak at hearings; and people here who may not speak. But many people are worried, afraid, and angry. Some of them write to their politicians and some of them vote.

Through years of hearings and testimony of experts, DOE leaders have heard some hard evidence about the witches' brew under the leaking waste tanks and where it's going. They've heard about the possibility of an explosion if a fast reactor with a sodium coolant like the FFTF were to be used for production purposes. It

shouldn't take a scientific genius to figure out that having a nuclear malfunction anywhere near the underground waste could be very unpleasant indeed, especially if there is no place to store the high-level waste that would be produced.

And I'd like to think that anyone could understand the pitiful irony of wanting to produce isotopes for cancer in a facility that could cause cancer, to add to the cancers already created by Hanford pollution. I was happy that this was brought up tonight, especially when the isotopes can be made more safely and cheaply elsewhere.

Plutonium-238 to provide electricity for space missions can also be made more safely and cheaply elsewhere, although I and others don't think that the idea of this deadly material going up into space is going to sit well with anyone who watched Apollo 13.

Here are a few of the impacts that I feel must be considered in any environmental impact study before a restart of FFTF:

That all funds that were intended for cleanup, but used for FFTF "hot" standby, be returned, and that no more be used;

That the DOE pay for every EIS required, not take that from cleanup;

That the mandated job of cleanup be completed; that adequate storage for high-level wastes be provided;

And that no human involved in nuclear activities at FFTF could ever make a mistake; that no mechanism involved in any part of this operation could ever malfunction, that no earthquake could ever jostle this site;

And ideally, that FFTF be shut down permanently, without further production missions.

And I'm reminded, too — I think we should restore all treaty rights with the Indian nation. It's disgraceful.

As a personal note to the DOE, please give us a break and forget all these harebrained projects. Give us back our peace of mind. If you can't or aren't willing to do your mandated job, please make way for some other agency or other group who can.

Also, I am in favor of all of these, especially the Alternative 5. Do I have to read them all, or can I just give them to you again?

THE FACILITATOR: Five minutes.

MS. MOLLY SEE: Okay. They're really good.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. If you want to give us a copy of that, a copy for the record, ma'am — you want us to take that for the record? Okay.

Over here.

STATEMENT OF ANN CHRISTOPHER

MS. ANN CHRISTOPHER: Hello. My name is Christopher, Ann. I lived in Hood River for about eight and a half years, so I've been here too. It's wonderful to come to such a lovely party; it's a bummer for the reason. I now live in Portland, which is not that far away.

I was at the meeting last night, and the first thing I'd like to mention is that — I'd like to note that a gentleman, a speaker, asked why, if Oregonians were so concerned with Hanford, that we sent the Trojan reactor there. And as a native Oregonian, I'd like to go on record that many of us Oregonians would have preferred that it be sent to the DOE as a paperweight. But that didn't happen.

Also, a scientist once told me "Never trust your life to science," and I use that as my mantra these days especially. I, too, am a

grandmother, and I hope that this — I don't have to see my grandchildren coming to these meetings.

I'm very sorry for you people because you have a job like buffalo hunters did, and soon timber workers did. And I hope you have a retraining program.

My first comment really addresses the recent format change in this meeting. I'd like to submit that after the elected officials speak, I would like to see the — any representatives from public interest groups speak next, so that they don't have to wait with the other people. Because by the time they speak and are chosen in this random selection, the media has gone home, most of the people have gone home. And they are our representatives. They are our only hope, besides all the — you folks here. But they tell us what we really need to know.

I'd also like to remind DOE of its commitment and promise to completely shut down and clean up Hanford by 2001. What happened? Does anyone know? I doubt that anyone knows.

Also, I'd like to remind the DOE that, from my understanding, they don't even know what's in some of those containment vessels, because

they've mutated. Again, I go on line as saying this is absolutely ludicrous to consider putting anything else up there.

I think it's interesting that this is — these meetings are held just shortly after we have discovered that it is now in the groundwater. The nuclear contamination is now in the groundwater up there.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: They made a mistake.

MS. ANN CHRISTOPHER: Oh, that's right. Excuse me.

The idea of putting anything up there is really — it's beyond ludicrous, it's criminal. And I — yeah, it really is.

I'd like to go on record for saying that I want number — Alternative 5 to not be Alternative 5, I want it to be the only alternative. But, I'm willing to have it be the first alternative, and I submit that that could happen and should happen.

The DOE, it appears, is going to break its promise to the taxpayers. And it would like us to believe that it has learned from its previous errors and can now run a safe facility and

can safely store the wastes incurred. I don't think anybody in this room, I don't think anybody in this Pacific Northwest is that stupid to believe that. No, we don't trust you. We don't trust you as far as we could throw you.

I think you should all move here, and maybe we'll all go swimming, and that would be a much better use of our time.

Thank you.

MS. AMBIE CONDON: Can you put this up for me?

THE FACILITATOR: Yeah, I'll get it [*adjusting microphone*].

Sir, in the turquoise out there — yeah.

STATEMENT OF AMBIE CONDON

MS. AMBIE CONDON: Thank you; that's just perfect.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

MS. AMBIE CONDON: My name is Ambie Condon. I'm from Goldendale, Washington, which is about sixty miles east of here.

And in my public comment I want to refer to the nine points that were put together by C-R-U. I'd like to emphasize that the EIS should

analyze the cost of the current cleanup budget for both maintenance and possible restart — accurate and verifiable. Start-up figures must be calculated and included.

Analyze all transportation costs and risks, including public safety and any counter-terrorist actions that may be needed.

Disclose all safety and environmental risks associated with FFTF restart, based on a new safety analysis.

And in addition, Alternative 5 that deactivates FFTF with no new production missions.

And now if I can digress, I personally am not a fan of the EIS process, because I've been involved with them in other things in the State of Washington. And I think really they're a tool for developers, and in this case you're the developer. Because the onus of proof falls on the public. And we're not the scientists, but we have to come before you -- it's like being in court. It's like discovery. And if we don't bring something up, then you don't have to look at it. And I think that's wrong. I think it's wrong that we have to do that.

And so I fantasize about what I would include in an EIS. And what I would have in an EIS is, I would look at the real business of Hanford, which is that big cash cow that's sitting out there.

And I'd like to look at how the corporate contractors have bribed my Washington State Senators and Representatives with lies about the cure for cancer.

And I'd like to look at the corporate contractors that focus on prosecuting whistle-blowers instead of fulfilling cleanup agreements.

And I'd like the EIS to look at the corporate contractors who spend their time creating accounting systems that have bilked the American taxpayers out of an estimated $85 million in overtime costs — that's now in court.

And I'd like to look at the corporate contractors who waste our time and money reneging on the Tri-Party Agreement, who constantly want to renegotiate milestones and safety thresholds instead of doing what we've been paying them to do.

And I have this fantasy that next time when we're all here, that all of us are sitting up at that table, and we have people from the rest

of the United States and the rest of the world representatives, and we're sitting up there.

And you got two podiums, and at this podium is the Secretary of Energy, Bill Richardson. Okay? And then you can have a couple of generals from the Joint Chiefs of Staff over here, and then you can have a couple of pinheads from NASA that want to talk about Star Wars. Okay?

And then on the other podium over there, you can have the CEO from Battelle and from Westinghouse and from Rockwell and from Fluor-Daniels.

And you guys can do this dance, and you can BS each other, and you can whitewash it, and you can do your consultation, door-revolving, and you can do your whatever -- wait; I wrote these really good things down -- palm-greasing and wheeling and dealing, and you can do all that BS in front of us. And we're sitting up there. And tell me how fast you're going to start up the FFTF, when we're sitting up there and we get to decide instead of you guys. I want to see it reversed.

And that's all I have to say.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, go ahead.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's all a mistake.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Let's all kneel down and pray.

STATEMENT OF TOBIAS AMMON

MR. TOBIAS AMMON: Good. Thank you. My name is Tobias Ammon, and I live here in Hood River since ten years, about.

I would like the DOE to include the following things in this environmental impact statement:

Characterize all existing contaminant sources at Hanford and all other sites before adding additional waste;

Do a cost-benefit analysis for all alternatives including total life-cycle costs, waste treatment, and disposal costs;

Analyze all transportation costs and risks, including public safety and any counter-terrorist actions that may be needed;

Analyze all impacts from additional spent fuel storage, and disclose all safety and environmental risks associated with FFTF restart, based on a new safety analysis.

I also think you should add a fifth alternative, and that is that you shut FFTF down

completely, and have no further production missions in the United States.

The isotopes, that was last year when all the people from Tri-Cities came, all real interesting, and sounds like a good deal. But you know, you create isotopes and you create radioactive waste at the same time, which is going to make somebody else get cancer. Somehow, that doesn't make sense; it's like you dig your own grave.

Is there any honesty left in politics? I wonder, you know. Or is it all about the dollar that somebody can make, maybe in this case a nuclear contractor and a few employees? Where there is potential money to be made, what does it matter?

The FFTF was to be turned off by the commitment of the DOE in 1995, but it hasn't happened. Instead, it runs on "hot" standby. That's really expensive. I think $32 million a year is a lot of money. So what is all this, running it on "hot" standby? It's like a back door that's still open, because officially the front door is locked. You can't — you know, you're not supposed to any more, but you keep it on "hot" standby so you can still do something with it.

When I asked about honesty in the first place, that's what I mean. Can we please shut it down as it was promised, and clean this up? Go on with cleanup priorities. Besides, I mean, this is the basic of nuclear energy and all those things.

I grew up in Germany, and about twenty years ago, that's when I first got to know about all those things. And it was, back then, the same thing: "It's all great, and it's really efficient and it only -- the principle of radioactive electricity makes total great sense, it's efficient," and all this. But it's not solved 100 percent. You can't store the waste safely; it cannot be done. It just can't be done, so we shouldn't produce it. We really shouldn't produce it. And well, what are you going to do with this stuff that's — okay, I'm almost done; two minutes.

What are you going to do if all this radioactive waste that's to be produced? We could put it in storage tanks. How about some of the leaking ones? I don't think it's funny. I really don't think it's funny. I think it's criminal to produce more of this stuff that cannot be stored. And that's totally irresponsible. And that's about it.

Please, I hope that you are listening to us and do not restart FFTF, and you go on with cleanup. I'm wearing the colors of hope; it's green.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF KAREN POLLOCK

MS. KAREN POLLOCK: My name's Karen Pollock. I'm a member of Columbia River United.

I'd like to just follow up on a comment that Mrs. See made earlier, having to do with the mission of NASA and how it relates to this facility. I am also very concerned about the waste stream that may be produced by this facility – we have yet to find out exactly what that will be. But I would like to focus my comments, not on the waste, but on the product.

And this fuel that will be used in fuel cells or in storage energy cells in space vehicles is very much a concern to me, because I feel that if we're going to evaluate this project, we need to evaluate the product, the risks inherent in using the product. And if you're going to use the NASA mission as a reason for justifying the restart of this facility, then you need to look at the risks of using this product in space, and you

need to look at the risks in launching this product into space.

And I believe when I walked in there was a display back here. I don't see it right now, but it mentioned something about use of nuclear material in space projects for twenty years, and there's been no problem. I don't feel good about that. I'm a space kid; I grew up — you know, I'll never forget the night they walked on the Moon, it was so exciting.

But I don't feel good about launching nuclear material through our atmosphere into space. Because you can say, "There's not been an accident in the use of this material, and we've got three more missions planned, and we've got to get out there to that moon of Pluto before it freezes over for another 200 years" — as if we can't wait 200 years to find out. Because there is a time and a place for everything that is appropriate. It is not appropriate to consider using nuclear fuel launched through our atmosphere into space. It is too risky. And that risk needs to be evaluated and looked at very carefully, and added, please, to the scope of this EIS. I think it's an unconscionable risk, and you dare not take it on my behalf.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: I had you coming to one of those microphones, and then we'll go here in the middle. Thanks.

STATEMENT OF JOETTE ERSICK

MS. JOETTE ERSICK: My name is Joette Ersick, and I am a native Oregonian. I remember the river before the dams were here, and we walked along and fished on the trails. And my father was hired to help build Hanford. And at the time, he didn't even know what he was working on, because he wasn't — he wasn't informed; he didn't need to know that. He was in the dirt and he was moving it, and he was a 701 operating engineer. And we settled here, and we've lived our life here and we've raised our families here.

And I notice that there's a lot of people in the country that are attracted to this area. It's one of the few places that you can find like this on the face of the Earth; it's very gorgeous, as you may have noticed coming here. And we've always had a love for this place, and done a lot of things to preserve it, and we've done without a lot of things that money could buy. And we've lived simply, and we kind of thought we were

nurturing the Earth by doing that. And now tonight, driving home for this meeting here from Portland, I heard on the radio that tank number — and I can't remember — whatever, is now leaking 39 parts more than allowed safe into the drinking water. There's more news coming up all the time: the frogs in the area don't look normal, the plants are beginning to absorb, and they're being tested. Well, this is what we're just now hearing on the news. But I think, in fact, people who live here know the truth. We know what's been happening up there. And it's a total impact like the dead zone at the Gulf of Mexico. This river feeds the ocean. And when something goes wrong with this — the dams that we built are not all that stable, either, and they're holding back a lot of silt. Floods happen; that's how this gorge was formed. And this is an active area for earthquakes and volcanoes, and so it really isn't a very safe place to have a reactor.

You know, we really implore you to consider all these factors, not just for us, because it's our back yard, but for the health and welfare of the entire planet. No restart, please.

THE FACILITATOR: Let's go here first.

STATEMENT OF JACK VILLA

MR. JACK VILLA: My name is Jack Villa. I'm from Trout Lake, Washington. I represent myself and my family.

I'd like to, first of all, thank Columbia River United and everyone else who has, for the last eleven years, done battle with the DOE. And it doesn't surprise me that we're here again, because the DOE has a supply line all the way back to Washington, D.C., all the way back to the Pentagon, and all the way into the pockets of the wealthiest people on this planet. So this is what we're doing battle with. You know, this is not an easy battle.

I have some questions for you. Is it not true that the original scientists, nuclear atomic scientists, refused to give the go-ahead for the first atomic explosion? Anyway, I don't expect an answer to that question, other than “Yes” or “No,” and I'll give you —.

THE FACILITATOR: Half a second.

MR. JACK VILLA: What is the reason for exploring space, in the first place, if we're — at the same time we're wasting the home planet? And

nuclear waste is not the only thing that we have to deal with that's not good for the planet.

Number 3, if we want to be in the forefront of nuclear science worldwide and we want to be in the forefront, I think the technology that neutralizes radioactive material would be the most in-demand science worldwide, and that's where we should put all our best brain power. And that probably will make the most money, in the final days.

Number 4, I have here, do you have a rehabilitation program for workers at Hanford to retrain them, like we presented for the loggers in this area? I highly suggest this, because it's pretty simple.

Number 5 -- oh, I had one more here. This was actually my first question: “Is it not true that the first use of nuclear energy was to kill thousands of women and children — for example, Nagasaki, Hiroshima?”

And all attempts at harnessing the atom for peaceful uses has diminished the health of the planet.

And the last thing, I understand that none of my emotional comments will be listened to,

so I will read this one thing for the record.

I would like – the U.S. DOE must add another Alternative 5 that permanently shuts down FFTF, without any further production missions nationwide.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Go ahead.

STATEMENT OF AN AUDIENCE MEMBER

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay, ready? I'll be eighty years old next March, God willing and the creeks don't rise and the Columbia doesn't get irradiated.

In 1937, my family moved from the slums of Chicago – in fact, we used to go up, and our hero was Al Capone, if any of you remember him, to get a look at him at night at Powell's Restaurant, Crawford and Madison Avenue. We moved out to Los Angeles, and it was absolute paradise: orchards, red cars, stroll down Hollywood – we lived right down – you could see that "Hollywood" sign; we lived at 939 North Kenmore. And it was perfect, and I thought after World War II that I might go back there. And I spent about one week with my family, and said, "I would never like to live here." Smog had ruined that city.

We've lived in San Diego. I think San Diego is going to grow to Phoenix. We've lived fifteen years in Hawaii up in the lava heights. When the cars go by all the time in the morning, you can see the smog. Fortunately, there's a trade wind that blows it off, but five miles out you can see it. I can see that in Portland now. I was coming home today, and I could barely see Mount Hood. And with the haze, people are calling it, but it is smog.

You all are fortunate to have lived here in paradise. We came ten years ago. We live — nine years ago. We live in White Salmon. I'd like to leave with you to think a little bit out of the box. I came here to learn tonight, and I learned a lot, and I learned from some wonderful people getting up to talk, and I'm sure these people have an awful lot to take back, too. And how it comes out, I don't know. And I'm not going to get involved in it; I'm more interested in you.

I have thirteen grandchildren. My passion for them is they never fight the wars that my generation has to fight. And the hundreds of people that I know walk the cemeteries of Europe. Europe hasn't had a war, and you look back in

history how long it's been. The Kosovo business is minor compared to what happened then, and really so is Vietnam and Korea. But my passion is that.

Now I tell you, as far as I'm concerned — this is just my opinion; I won't try to back it up with statistics, and I — and we're all talking about different things. But I wish that we could have a group here that could talk with the emotion and passion against Hanford, which may be justified — and I'm not arguing for it — but I wish you could put that into the automobile, which every one of you use. Because you don't want to give up the automobile, and I don't want to give up the automobile, but the automobile is polluting, polluting, polluting, and it's going to kill a lot more of your kids than radiation from Hanford.

I also would like to point out France has gone full-blower on nuclear energy. They have something between 75 and 100 reactors. The reason I bring this up again is, oil is going to come out — is going to cause a big problem. I won't see it, some of you won't see it. But oil is what causes wars. The big oil sources of the Middle East and Indonesia — and you know what's going on there. So yes, you've got a problem here, and to you it's the

most important problem, but it's — all I can say is, I don't think -- and I'm not trying to discourage you from what you're doing. But please think out of the box a little bit, as where we're going to be twenty and thirty years from now, what's going to happen because of oil, what oil is already doing to this country.

Incidentally, in the major earthquake they just had in Turkey, they had a big water problem. They sent five Navy ships there. You don't hear about it any more, because the best way to make water is to desalinize it from seawater, and that's inexhaustible. You need energy to do that. The best energy to do that, I might add, is nuclear power.

So I know you don't like nuclear, and I don't — and one of the things I've learned in life is, part of the problem in living is making choices. Neither one of them are any good, and so you make the best you can. But please don't stay — don't let the word "nuclear" scare you. Look at what's going to happen. And I'm not justifying Hanford. I'm just talking to a bunch of dedicated, wonderful people, and saying think a little bigger, think a little longer, think on the pros and cons.

And that's my opinion. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: We'll go to the back. Yes, you had your — yeah, sure.

STATEMENT OF ELIZABETH SEE

MS. ELIZABETH SEE: So I can go ahead?

THE FACILITATOR: Yeah.

MS. ELIZABETH SEE: There, is that good? Okay.

Okay, my name is Elizabeth See. I'm from White Salmon, Washington. And I do agree with the gentleman who just spoke, that the solution is not gas or oil or nuclear, it will lie somewhere else, maybe in solar energy. I don't know; I'm not a scientist. But there's got to be something better than irradiating ourselves for 200,000 years.

The alternative that I chose for the FFTF is to have it shut down permanently. The EIS must prove that humans will stop making errors, period. This is the only way to guarantee that these radioactive materials will be kept out of the environment.

Recently, the best scientific minds in our country, our country has to offer, made a boo-boo converting to metric, and subsequently a

$125-million piece of equipment smashed into the planet Mars. Recent accidental radioactive releases in Japan and Korea demonstrate that human error is a worldwide phenomenon. In your EIS, you must prove to us that humans will stop goofing up, period.

The next thing that the EIS must prove is that there will be no more natural disasters.

I know that you people from Hanford do make a lot of money creating nuclear waste, and that it scares you to imagine a world without it. But I assure you that there is enough out there that there will be no need to create any more. You will never run out of it, so I suggest you go home and clean it up.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, we'll go back there. Okay, sir, you're after her. Thanks.

STATEMENT OF DANA VISSY

MS. DANA VISSY: Hi. My name is Dana Vissy, and I represent myself, Dana Vissy. And I've been living in the Gorge for the last couple of years and I grew up in the Northwest, so I'm pretty familiar with a lot of environmental subjects. But for some reason, nuclear power has just been out of my scope of understanding for a while, and it's

something that I've been more involved in in the last year or two with Y2K issues and such.

But I wasn't here last year, and I think that that's important, because I am here today. And I think that I'm not alone in that. I'm sure there's plenty of people here that were not here last year, that are here today to say the same thing that was said last year. And I think if this -- if this meeting comes up again next year, there'll be plenty of people here that were not here this year, that will say the same things again. And that is "No; shut it down."

And I don't think that — at first I really didn't want to talk, because I wasn't — I don't know all the science behind things, I don't know all the financial details, but I do know — I think I know the difference between right and wrong. For me, this seems like the wrong thing to do. And I think it's wrong, and the reason it speaks to me most personally is that my cousin has cancer. She has thyroid cancer, and she grew up in Kennewick, Washington, and she's only thirty-three years old. And she is now a part of a study of many women her age and others of her generation that are coming down with thyroid cancer. And I don't think that

that exists in a vacuum. I think that that is directly as a result from Hanford.

And I think that in order to have a full-scale scoping process, I think that you have to look at the cancer rates, and I think that you have to look at the environmental impacts. You have to look at the health records. You have to look at what's actually going on to really understand the impact of Hanford, the impact Hanford has had on this area and these communities downstream, downwind. Because I think if you do that and you really take into account all those statistics and all those facts, I don't think that the financial benefits, the people that are going to be profiting, the people that are going to — the systems, the structures, the infrastructure that it's going to be able to maintain, I don't think it's going to be worth it.

So if I think if we went — if we end up here again in this scoping process, if you do take into account our requests and you do that and you look at those statistics, and we find ourselves up here again, then I'll know for sure that you guys aren't listening, because it's the same thing that's been said again and again. And if we find ourselves

here again, then shame on you, because this is wrong. Thanks.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD HORREL

MR. RICHARD HORREL: Hello. My name is Richard Horrel. I'm a Hood River resident. I'm representing myself today.

For the record, I'd like to state that I am totally opposed to any restart of the FFTF. I think it's absurd. You people really ought to be spending your money in psychiatric care.

Do you even consider this is something we're dealing with, is spent nuclear reactor fuel? No one in this room, regardless of how intelligent you are, how much you've studied this, can tell me in any convincing way that we can get rid of this stuff within the next 200,000 years, which is well beyond anyone living in this room, right? We're not going to live — you're not going to live 200,000 years, I'm not going to live to — and there's no real known way that we're going to say, "Well, in the next five years we'll figure out how to deal with that problem." It doesn't make sense. It's illogical to continue to create a waste we don't know how to deal with, that is affecting your lives — your lives, my life. The water you're

drinking presently, right now, may have radioactive particles. And you don't really know how one particle per so-many, so-many, is going to do you any harm. But those radioactive particles, after a long period of time inhabiting your body, may decide to go, you know, radical on you and cause a problem. Anyway, you don't know.

For the record, I'd like to say that if you do continue with the environmental impact statement, it must include these things:

Demonstrate a compelling need for any new mission recommended with full consideration of alternative means of meeting those needs;

Characterize all existing contaminant sources at Hanford and all other sites before adding additional waste;

Analyze all potential new waste streams and their cumulative impact to the environment at all sites;

Do a cost-benefit analysis for all alternatives, including total life cycle costs, waste treatment, and disposal costs -- a linear accelerator versus the FFTF, to use the example;

Analyze the cost to the current cleanup budget for both maintenance and possible

restart. Accurate and verifiable start-up figures must be calculated and included.

Include any other companion facilities and their costs, waste stream, and potential impacts to the environment, including reprocessing.

Analyze all transportation costs and risks, including public safety and any counter-terrorist actions that may be needed.

Allow for independent nuclear safety oversight of the FFTF restart and operation, if restart is recommended.

Analyze all impacts from additional spent fuel storage — very important.

Disclose all safety and environmental risks associated with the FFTF restart, based on a new safety analysis.

Now disclose all safety and environmental risks — oh, before I get cut off, again, the fifth — obviously, we're all here and you know what we're going to say. The fifth option is to shut the thing down permanently. Don't bother starting it back up again. Nobody in this room really wants to see that happen, except for a few people that are going to profit from that direct

action. But we're not going to profit from it, our children are not going to profit from it, and my children are not going to profit from it in any way, shape, or form.

And then you're all kidding yourselves if you really believe that we're going to find a safe way to deal with this, because there is no safe way to deal with it, and that's the way it goes.

Anyway, having said that, I'd like to make people aware that life-style is about choices. And if you make a choice to live a life-style that's very toxic, you also make a choice to deal with the problems that happen as a result of that toxic life-style. And that means cancers and other things that happen to us as we get older. You can combat all of these things through prevention, something that's been happening for tens of billions of years, by eating right and getting plenty of exercise and lots of sunlight and so on and so forth, and not exposing yourself unnecessarily to toxins like radioactivity.

So again, it just makes sense that we don't want to introduce this to an environment that's already overtoxified from all of these other

problems, if there are alternatives. I understand that you — you're probably all getting paid to be here, which is wonderful that you get paid with our tax dollars to be here, to listen to us. We're not getting paid to be here. And I know that, again, the emotional comments nobody's listening to, and that you're all very well trained at not listening to them, which is really good of you guys to do that stuff. We all feel very important when we come here and not get heard. Anyway, I was here last year. We all — we all knew the feeling, so — and that's why we're really very disappointed. We're very disappointed that we have to continue this.

I want to make a personal note that I think all of this — money is a big part of it. I think the whole warmongering thing — I think there's a huge cover-up of what Hanford really was all about, which was killing tens of thousands of people. Weapons of mass destruction -- weapons of mass destruction is what it's really all about. And if we don't want to see that happen, we have to shut the FFTF down. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: All right. Let's see, just for time here and for yourself, how many

people still want to comment tonight? So ten, twelve. Okay, just checking.

Okay. Yes, ma'am.

STATEMENT OF LAURIE CROSS

MS. LAURIE CROSS: Okay. I'm Laurie Cross. I live in the White Salmon area. I've been in the area for fourteen years, and I've been in the Northwest since 1967. And I'll also be sending you more extensive written comments.

I oppose reopening the reactor. We need to clean up Hanford, not start more production which will produce more waste.

I understand that Canadian sources are available for medical necessities at a lower cost than FFTF.

I also believe the same thing that everybody else has been saying, that the U.S. DOE must add an alternative that permanently shuts down the FFTF, without any further production missions nationwide.

And I also would like to comment on the way these hearings are being handled. I received the announcement of the hearings from the Department of — Washington Department of Ecology, just yesterday, only one day before this hearing,

even though the calendar inside goes back to early October. Kind of late notice for — about hearings, I'd say. Thanks to CRU and the Oregon Department of Energy, I found out about these and I'm here.

I also understand that the American Nuclear Society, a prostart-up group, is taking bus loads of people — we heard about this earlier — from eastern Washington to some of the hearings, to give the view that everyone is for start-up, or a lot more people are, in areas where that might not be the case. It appears to me that there are efforts to discourage public participation, not encourage it. These sorts of things undermine the validity of these hearings and disrupt access for public comment. They reduce public confidence in the hearing process.

So I would like to ask for an extension on written comments for this issue. This seems a really short time, just until October 31st.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Yes, sir, then the person in the front here, then in the back. Okay.

MR. JAY CARROL: Ready?

Hi, I'm Jay —

THE FACILITATOR: [*Indiscernible.*]

MR. JAY CARROL: Hello, I'm —

THE FACILITATOR: [*Indiscernible.*] Go ahead.

STATEMENT OF JAY CARROL

MR. JAY CARROL: Good evening. Hello. I'm Jay Carrol from Bingen, Washington. I am Jay Carrol from Bingen, Washington. Yes, Jay Carrol from Bingen, Washington.

Thank you for coming here tonight to the Columbia River Gorge, a place that quite possibly the people here have a chance to hear you, and will be most affected by any mishaps at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation.

Why are we here at a scoping hearing for any EIS that is production-related, that does not address the treatment and containment of waste? Perhaps this EIS does address nice, interesting features such as space and exploration and medicine, but it still does not produce -- or help contain or stabilize existing waste.

Why am I, a citizen of the Northwest, still coming to these hearings and pleading for our safety after years of defending the Tri-Party Cleanup Agreement — and our rights, at that? Why does the DOE continue to ignore the real threat to

our environment, the real need to clean up existing nuclear waste storage facilities, and the real need to permanently contain nuclear waste, and stop introduction of all future reactors?

Why can the DOE consider health risks in their EIS standards that are three times more deadly than the Federal EPA standards and four times more deadly than Washington State standards?

Why can't the DOA — DOE adhere to the Tri-Party Agreement and clean up Hanford's deadly mess, and stop FFTF?

Why do we, the people of the State of Washington and Oregon, have to waste vital dollars in filing suit against the DOE for noncompliance to the cleanup agreement, money and effort that could be used to help clean up?

Why does -- why does the DOE even consider producing more solid and liquid wastes from the FFTF, when there are hundreds of thousands of gallons of deadly liquid and cake waste that they are unable to contain, waste that is stored in outdated tanks that are presently leaking into the Columbia River and also threatening to explode?

Why is it so hard for DOE to accept the mistakes of the past and move forward with a

containment and treatment of these outdated tank farms, and not produce more?

Why is the creation of more tanks and more storage and possibly new reactors considered to be cleanup, while the treatment and solidification and stabilization through vitrification has not — has been delayed, not by months or years, but decades?

Why can't the DOE just shut down and deactivate the FFTF reactor and pay back the 100 million that has been wasted and drained from the cleanup Superfund in order to keep the FFTF on "hot" standby?

Why, when it is so clear that nuclear waste treatment is of first priority, which presents huge technical challenges, and it's development of the technology and the facilities to permanently store and contain hazardous waste — it's baffling that the DOE can even consider more production of dangerous nuclear material that not — is not even necessary.

I am tired of asking why, and demand that DOE adhere to the Tri-Party Agreement, and realize that there's no time for delay. The Hanford tank farms have to be contained and stabilized

before it is too late. Stop wasting valuable time, and clean up Hanford.

In your EIS, please demonstrate a compelling need for any new missions recommended, with a full consideration of alternative means of meeting these needs.

Characterize all existing containment sources at Hanford and other sites before adding additional waste.

Analyze all potential nuclear waste streams and their cumulative impact to the environment at all sites.

Do a cost-benefit analysis for all alternatives, including total life cycle costs, waste treatment, and disposal costs. Examples — you ought to look at a linear accelerator. It makes a heck of a lot more sense than a fast flux reactor.

Analyze the cost to the current cleanup budget for both maintenance and possible restart. Accurate and verifiable start-up figures must be calculated and included.

Include any other companion facilities and their costs, waste streams, and potential impacts to the environment, including reprocessing.

Analyze all transportation costs and risks. Include public safety and counterterrorist actions that may be needed.

Allow for independent nuclear safety oversight of the Fast Flux Test Facility restart and operation if restart is recommended.

Analyze all impacts from the addition of spent fuel storage.

Disclose all safety and environmental risk associated with the Fast Flux Test Facility and restart based on a new safety analysis.

And finally, the U.S. DOE must consider as a first alternative, that we present as Alternative 5, that they currently shut down the Fast Flux Test Facility, without any further production, period.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF NICK ANDREWS

MR. NICK ANDREWS: Thanks. Hello. My name is Nick Andrews. I live in Hood River. Not used to speaking in front of a microphone.

But I'd like to ask that you include the Alternative 5 to permanently shut down the FFTF reactor, and also that you include the — in your environmental impact statement, that you

include the environmental impact on Germany. In one of your alternatives you included buying MOX fuel from Germany, that you include the production of that fuel in Germany and the transport of that fuel from Germany.

And in your No Action Alternative you mentioned purchasing plutonium-238 from Russia, and that you include the environmental impacts of that production in Russia and the transport of that from Russia.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

STATEMENT OF KIM BIRKLAND

CENTRAL CASCADE ALLIANCE

MS. KIM BIRKLAND: All right. I got a little tired tonight. My name is Kim Birkland. I'm the director of Central Cascade Alliance in Hood River. I live here. I was born and raised in Oregon. I'm also the conservation chair of the Gorge Paddlers Club, and we educate paddlers — I educate paddlers in our agreed-upon local, regional, and national conservation issues related to muscle-powered paddle sports. Recently, I took twenty people down the Hanford Reach, right next to

Hanford, talking about these issues. I'm also on the board of Columbia River United.

And I usually make my comments to the United States Forest Service. And the tax dollars being wasted by the Department of Energy on the Hanford site, this EIS and FFTF, makes the losses from the Federal timber sale program look like toothpicks.

I'd like to make some comments, make them brief – you've heard them all before tonight. First I'd ask – like to ask that the Department of Energy demonstrate a compelling need for any new missions recommended, with full consideration of alternative means in meeting those needs when you're looking at the FFTF EIS.

Characterize all existing contaminant sources at Hanford and all other sites before adding additional waste.

Analyze all potential new waste streams and their cumulative impact – that's very important, cumulative impact – to the environment at all sites on the Hanford Nuclear Reservation.

Do a cost-benefit analysis for all alternatives, including total life cycle costs,

waste treatment, and disposal costs — for example, a linear accelerator versus the FFTF.

Analyze the cost to the current cleanup budget for both maintenance and possible restart. Accurate and verifiable start-up figures must be calculated and included.

Include any other companion facilities and their costs, waste streams, and potential impacts to the environment, including reprocessing.

Analyze all transportation costs and risks, including public safety and any counter-terrorist actions that may be needed.

Allow for independent nuclear safety oversight of the FFTF restart and operation if restart is recommended.

Analyze all impacts from additional spent fuel storage.

Disclose all safety and environmental risks associated with FFTF and restart based on a new safety analysis.

And finally, the U.S. Department of Energy must add another Alternative 5, that permanently shuts down the FFTF, without any further production missions nationwide. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, let's go here first, and then you're next.

STATEMENT OF NORRIS CHEATHAM

FRIENDS OF THE COLUMBIA GORGE

MR. NORRIS CHEATHAM: Hello. My name is Norris Cheathum. I represent the 3,000-plus members of the Friends of the Columbia Gorge. We're mostly a land-use watch organization. We oppose things that detract from the scenic area, that in some way serve as a detriment to the National Scenic Act.

In this case, we see the — or I see the FFTF facility as more of a threat to the scenic and natural attributes of the Columbia River Gorge than the Beehouse, than the proposed casino, than 'most anything you want to come up with. And I've got a short statement that I would like to read here, that will just summarize our position on this.

"The Friends of the Columbia Gorge oppose any new projects and activities which adversely inputs" -- "impacts the natural and unspoiled character of the Columbia River Gorge. Restarting the FFTF is not compatible with this mission, in our opinion."

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, you, sir.

STATEMENT OF PAT SCALLON

MR. PAT SCALLON: My name is Pat Scallon. I'm recently — I've moved here recently. And I really came here to learn, and I've learned a great deal listening to all the comments here.

But there's one thing that's really troubled me a lot as I listen to all of this. I'm a lawyer by trade, and as I listened to all the anger and all of the fear and all of the hyperbole that has gone on here, I see a siege mentality. I see the people that live here, that love this place as much as I do — they fear that they're being invaded by something that they neither understand nor they asked for. And I see the scientists — my father worked at a nuclear plant. I — most of my friends are engineers. I am not afraid of science, I am afraid of those people who make the decisions about science. I'm not afraid of a nuclear reactor, I'm afraid of the nuclear reactor that has an alcoholic monitoring things. I'm afraid of the decisions that are made in human terms. I'm not afraid of the science.

And I think that what I would like the people who propose and who are vested in these

programs, that if you want the people who are threatened to not have this siege mentality, then you have to put away your science, because that will not convince them. You have to put back on your humanity, and you have to keep your promises. That's where it is.

Everybody here has come up, or most of the people that have come up here, and they've basically said one thing: "That place is dirty; you promised to clean it up, and you haven't done a thing."

Now, I don't know if you should start-up that Fast Flux or not, but I'm telling you one thing. If you are scientists and if you believe in your own capacity, then direct your energies to cleaning it up. Because you start cleaning that place up, you get one barrel cleaned up, you get two barrels cleaned up, and you come back to the people of Hood River, and they will drop their defenses somewhat. They will begin to trust. But these people have every reason to be afraid of you, and it's your problem to correct this misapprehension, if you feel it is a misapprehension.

Because I believe in science. I believe you can do it, and I believe you can do it

safely. But I don't believe there's the political will to do it. I don't think that there are the priorities in place to make sure that first things get done first. The first thing is, find a way to deal with the material that is there in a safe, permanent fashion. You finish that project, direct all your attention to that project. You come back here with an answer to that, and you guys will have a very different audience.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF TIM YOUNG

MR. TIM YOUNG: My name is Tim Young. I'm from Goldendale, Washington.

And I would like to start by — I'm mostly going to focus on number 1 on our list, which is, I think that the U.S. DOE needs to demonstrate a compelling need for any new mission recommended, with full consideration of alternative means of meeting those needs.

Now, when I look at this information, what I would call the scoping of the scoping process, there's nothing contentious here. If you looked at this, you would believe that the DOE just wants to do what's best for everyone. We have the "Fast Facts: One out of every three persons

admitted to U.S. hospitals undergoes medical procedures using isotopes," et cetera, et cetera. There's no "Fast Facts"; they're saying, "One out of every three people in this country get cancer, and many of those cancers have been directly related to radioactivity." There's no balance in this material. There's no citizen input in any of these things. If the public wants something, they can go to a public information center. This doesn't look, to us, or at least to me, like you're really presenting both sides of the issue that needs to be brought out and opened up. That's one thing.

I mean, it's a little too slick. I mean, you have the little kid with cancer, with the little doll. It — that kind of public relations just, to me — I've dealt with DOE for ten years on these issues. It just looks like bad faith. And as many volumes of public information and input as there's been on all these issues, there should be plenty of people, experts, representatives of the other side, that should be represented in your materials. That's constructive or destructive criticism, however you want to look at it.

To the specifics of the scoping, for one thing, I think that, in fact, there has been a

plutonium accident involving spacecraft. There was a Russian spacecraft a few years ago that -- a satellite, I believe, that reentered the atmosphere and spread plutonium throughout the Andes. And so I think that the impact of that accident should be considered.

And the idea that the safety of using plutonium in space -- I think that it's irresponsible of the Department of Energy to take NASA at their word for that safety, if we're going to be starting up a new production facilities to create something that they claim they need. So I think you should consider the safety factors of plutonium and its use.

The other thing is that, although we were told that the missions today did not include the production of tritium or materials for nuclear weapons, I don't think that should preclude the stock — the end of production of nuclear materials for nuclear weapons, to meet these other needs.

Those facilities that are presently producing tritium or other materials used for nuclear weapons should be considered in the EIS, whether those — I mean, after all, how many nuclear weapons do we have? Over 8,000, 10,000, something

like that? How many have we ever used? Thank God we've only used two on populations, but we've tested a few more — you know, less than a hundred. Those ratios -- if we need these medical isotopes so badly, we can surely give up some of those nuclear weapons to get them. So I think that has to be considered in the EIS.

And finally, just a personal note. Today I was thinking about what to say here tonight, and I began to realize that if another country told our country that they had trenches filled with toxic and radioactive waste on the edge of one of our water sources, and that water was leaching towards our — one of our rivers, and that they were going to take the money that we were going to use stop that, and use it to keep the FFTF on "hot" standby, we would consider that an act of terrorism if somebody else did it to us.

If someone said, "We're going to drive around with highly radioactive materials in trucks and railways," when who knows, 40,000 people a year die on our highways from accidents, we would consider that an irresponsible terrorist act.

And I could go on, but my point is that if someone else was doing it to us, we would

consider that an act of aggression against our country. If we do it against ourselves, somehow we're just supposed to expect — accept it as part of the bureaucratic problems that come along with having a nuclear weapons program and nuclear energy programs.

STATEMENT OF AN AUDIENCE MEMBER

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think you should include in your environmental impact statement that geologists assess the geological stability of the Hanford area into the next several centuries. I don't see anything in your material that talked about having geologists study that matter.

Also, you should do a cost analysis of all the lawsuits from individuals that may be harmed by radioactive exposure in the future. Look what's happened to the tobacco industries, and that could certainly happen to the government. The government's getting sued all the time.

Also, you should do a deep and comprehensive analysis of the mud at the bottom of the Columbia to assess past radioactive deposits, and based on that, how much deeper it will grow over the next century.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

STATEMENT OF KEITH HARDING

MR. KEITH HARDING: My name is Keith Harding. I live in the Hood River Valley here.

Back in the early 1970s when I was in college, I remember going to a lecture, and it was some kind of engineer/scientist with a Ph.D., and he was speaking about solar power. And he said that if America had the will and the commitment, we could be completely solar-powered within like a twenty-year span. Now, that man at the time was probably about seventy years old, so he's probably not with us any more. And I'm sure there's bezillions of scientists around that could argue that any which way. But the key is the will and the commitment.

What is our obsession with founding everything in death? We talk about great medical possibilities with it. It basically boils down to using some form of deadly force to try to heal, when there's way, way more traditional ways of healing, way less deadly.

Time for all you good folks, all you good people, to do some retraining. Get into other forms of engineering, and reduce this obsession with death in America and in the world. Really, you're all good people.

STATEMENT OF BRIAN SCHULTZ

MR. BRIAN SCHULTZ: My name is Brian Schultz, and I live in Hood River Valley. I've been here for sixteen years.

Twenty-five years ago, I graduated with honors from the University of Michigan School of Engineering. I've been trained as a scientist. The science does scare me. One of the things I learned while in school was that there is no safe and secure way to deal with the waste. Twenty-five years ago, I was able to foresee the problems caused by the accumulation of nuclear waste, and I've tried to bring about a stop to the production of more waste. Twenty-five years later, we still don't have the capacity to deal safely with the waste that we have already accumulated, some of which has now leaked into our groundwater. Where is that radioactivity going to end up?

For the record, I strongly request that the DOE include in its programmatic environmental impact statement the following:

Demonstrate a compelling need for any new mission recommended, with full consideration of alternative means of meeting these needs.

Characterize all existing containment sources at Hanford and all other sites before adding additional waste.

Analyze all potential new waste streams and their cumulative impact on the environment at all sites.

Do a cost-benefit analysis for all alternatives, including total life cycle costs, waste treatment, and disposal costs.

Analyze the cost to the current cleanup budget for both maintenance and possible restart. Accurate and verifiable start-up figures must be calculated and included.

Include any other companion facilities and their costs, waste streams, and potential impacts to the environment, including reprocessing.

Analyze all transportation costs and risks, including public safety and any counterterrorist actions that may be needed.

Allow for independent nuclear safety oversight of FFTF restart and operation if restart is recommended.

Analyze all impacts from additional spent fuel storage.

Disclose all safety and environmental risks associated with FFTF restart based on a new safety analysis.

And the U.S. DOE must add another alternative that permanently shuts down FFTF, without any further production missions nationwide.

I believe that many of DOE's and its contractors' employees could be used to clean up this mess that we now have.

And in closing, paraphrasing Upton Sinclair, “It's difficult for a person to understand the truth when their paycheck demands that they don't.”

STATEMENT OF BRENDON RON MORRIS

MR. BRENDON RON MORRIS: Hi. My name is Brendon Ron Morris. I've lived all my life in the Columbia Gorge area. And I just wanted to say a little bit.

And if this machine does get started back up, and it produces a lot of waste and it turns the world into a trash can, it's left to the kids to clean it up.

That's all I have to say.

STATEMENT OF AN AUDIENCE MEMBER

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'd just like to say something real quickly, that I think that Alternative 5 that we propose, is the only alternative that should be really considered.

But getting back to Alternative 1, which says to restart the FFTF, I'd like to add on the description that you move the Department of Energy downstream at Hanford.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: What a good idea.

STATEMENT OF LYNN JAECKLE

MS. LYNN JAECKLE: My name is Lynn Jaeckle, and I'm a Hood River resident. I used to live in Houston and know quite a few people at NASA, so the cleanup of nuclear waste and its safety has been up for debate for many years with me.

I want to address the scope, because that's what this meeting was supposed to be about. And I think the biggest problem is the lack of a No FFTF Alternative.

Another problem I have is where you list impact areas to be analyzed, and you call that list tentative. I hope that means that nothing is going to be deleted, but only more areas might be added.

And I'm not opposed to progress or research, and if you can figure out how to make it environmentally safe, I'm not even opposed to nuclear energy, *per se*. What I am opposed to is the fact that the cleanup hasn't happened. But all this time and money is being spent on governmental hoop jumping and not cleaning up Hanford, which was promised. So really, this whole thing is kind of totally out of line, because it's like putting the cart before the horse.

That's all I have to say.

Oh, and most of what everybody else said, I double it.

STATEMENT OF AN AUDIENCE MEMBER

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. When I was a little kid, I used to go to the Buster Brown shoe store and put on shoes, and stand there in a scope, and the shoe salesman and my mother and I would all stare at the bones in my feet in the shoes.

And then I got a little older, and there was something wrong; they couldn't figure out what to do with me. So they stood me in front of a fluoroscope, and I remember standing there and the doctor was saying, "There's her stomach and there's

her pyloric valve," and they just did a general tour of my body while I stood in front of this machine.

And then I remember when I was still in public school reading in the newspaper about people in Kentucky and Tennessee couldn't drink the milk for a while because there was something on the grass that the cows ate that made the milk no good. And so I began to know about radiation.

And then I went off to college, and I happened to go to a small private school, not very far from a place called Oak Ridge, Tennessee. And then I went off and I was in medical research, and I've used isotopes.

And then I got a little older, and then I got thyroid deficiency and thyroid disease. And then I got ovarian cancer, which has an 85 to 100 percent mortality.

And I remember Dixie Lee Ray and all the things that she — wonderful things she was going to do.

I couldn't figure out why I had thyroid disease, because I'd only been here thirty years, and I lived this way instead of downwind from Hanford. I eventually found out, in the past few years, that they also were releasing radiation

outside Oak Ridge, Tennessee. It was a nice valley to do research, to see what would happen. So I wonder how many other people back in Tennessee and in the Midwest have what I have.

In working in research, I know that — I know all the good that radiation can do. I also know that, just like when they were staring at the bones in my feet, they didn't know what they were doing, and when they were staring at the organs in my body, they didn't know what they were doing, and when Dixie Lee Ray said that she was going to make canals around the world with atomic energy, she didn't know what she was saying, and when they were releasing radiation around Oak Ridge to see what would happen, they didn't know what they were doing.

And unfortunately, we still don't know what we're doing, but the mess is there. And just staring at bones in your feet, or some valley, or the grass and the milk being contaminated — we have now got a situation there at Hanford that, when I lay in bed at night thinking about how do you clean up groundwater. There is no way. How do you clean up a river as big as the Columbia River? There is no way. And we're talking about the half-life.

Until you can clean it up, there is absolutely no reason to be talking this way. Don't even consider making more. You know, animals either keep their nests clean or they die in their own filth. And that's what we are right now. We have contaminated our nest, and we will die, and your children and your grandchildren, and your mothers and fathers and your aunts and uncles, and all the rest are going to die in our contamination. Don't do anything until we can figure out how to clean up our mess. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF CINDY DE BRULER

COLUMBIA RIVER UNITED

MS. CINDY DE BRULER: I'm a little more wide awake than I was last night at this time. I'm Cindy de Bruler, Director of Columbia River United. I welcome you all to Hood River, Oregon. I hope that you've had your eyes and your ears open and that you've heard and felt the message. I'm really proud of my community and being a part of the people here.

And I think that what you need to do at this point is to go back to Washington, D.C., where this problem originated. It's a political problem. It didn't originate with the people in

Richland. It's a political problem. And tell them that the political heat is too great, it's too much of a risk for them to move any further with it. And they better listen.

I've been trying to get in touch with Vice President Gore, with key people that are involved with this decision and won't take a stand. And as you know, it's very, very difficult to penetrate those walls back there. But I see you people as our channel; you can speak for us. And I'm really glad that you chose to come to Hood River, this little tiny town on the Columbia, as one of seven sites for a national DOE hearing. Thank you for coming, and please take our message back.

STATEMENT OF CHRISTOPHER NIGARD

MR. CHRISTOPHER NIGARD: My name is Christopher Nigard, and I live in White Salmon, Washington. And I would like to thank you all for coming and having a meeting in our area. I know it must be difficult to stand up there for the hours you've been here and feel the tension in the room, so I really appreciate it, because I think it's not easy for anybody.

What I'd like to go on the record as saying is that I would like to see in the scope an

alternative, and not number — not numbered number five, but perhaps number — at least number one, be that the DOE deactivate the FFTF, and that there is no further nuclear production in the nation.

But I'd also like to go further and ask that in that scope that the DOE considers changing its total mission statement from production of nuclear energy into not only cleanup, but also to put the money and its energy and its capable scientists into finding a way to neutralizing the poison that we've created with the waste. It would not — it would just be a shift of a paradigm from a — from production of something that's a poison and a toxin that's harmful to everyone and every living thing, not only in our country, but in the world, to something where we could perhaps find a way that we could not only clean it up, but neutralize it and make it unharmful to us, and then go on from there, but to discontinue the production till we can have that means. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF GREG DE BRULER

MR. GREG DE BRULER: Hi, it's Greg de Bruler.

(Facilitator adjusting microphone.)

That's okay, you don't need to do it; I can bend over.

I just want to thank you for coming here, because Hood River, this valley, this gorge, is between two mountains, and the grandfathers and the great-grandfathers and all the Indians that lived here way before we ever came here, came here because it's a very special, sacred spot in the world. We call it, “The Gorge;” we call it gorgeous. I've been here since 1983, and what I've found is that it's a spiritual center, that people come from all over the world, that come here, and then they end up living here.

What we have here and what would happen tonight was the people, the souls, the people in the future talking to us now, looking way out into the future, and realizing that we're on the wrong track.

Now you have a problem.

Unfortunately, you're sitting on that side of the fence, and you have this burden, because I believe that you've been enlightened. I believe that the lights have come on and that you understand what we're talking about and why FFTF makes no sense.

So you have different paths you can go. You can go down the road and do an EIS and get into this and spend more money. Or you could make it simple. You could go up to Secretary Richardson and say, "Hey, it doesn't make economic sense, it doesn't make political sense; there will be a war, a legal battle you will lose; it doesn't make sense."

This administration has done a lot to try to make environmental ethics a reality. And when we go back to our founding fathers, the time of George Washington and the Iroquois nation, they taught us something, but we lost it. And that was that we are responsible for our actions for at least seven generations. But we aren't, and we don't. We don't act like we're responsible for our actions. Unfortunately, in those days they never knew what contamination was, radioactivity was.

And I just want you to realize that — I hope you can go talk to Mr. Richardson and that you can make him understand. If he needs to give something to the Tri-Cities for a token, do a linear accelerator. But do not think that FFTF will ever get started again, because the political will is here. This is a sampling of what's in the Northwest

and what's in this nation. And we don't need to spend any more money going down this road.

Again, I thank you for coming; I really do. And it was fun. And I did get the bar to stay open later — and that shouldn't be on the record, so you can cut that off. They usually close at 12:00, but they'll stay open till 1:00 tonight. And I'd like to have a beer. So thanks.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. And you said you're treating everyone? Is that what you said?

(Laughter.)

Thank you for coming. This meeting is officially adjourned. Thanks a lot, and thank you for your patience this evening.

(Whereupon, at 11:17 p.m. the meeting was concluded)

C E R T I F I C A T E

We hereby certify that this is the transcript of the public meeting called by the Department of Energy concerning its

NUCLEAR INFRASTRUCTURE

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

held on Wednesday, October 20, 1999, in Hood River, Oregon, and that this is a full and correct transcription of the proceedings.

_____
Karl Fuss, Reporter

_____
William Wagner, Transcriber